This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Stanley Manning.

Lombard.

Mar. 6, 1904.

THEOLOGY OF UNIVERSALISM:

BEING

AN EXPOSITION

OF ITS DOCTRINES AND TEACHINGS, IN THEIR LOGICAL AND MORAL RELATIONS;

INCLUDING

A Criticism of the Texts

CITED IN PROOF OF THE TRINITY, VICARIOUS ATONEMENT, NATURAL DEPRAVITY, A GENERAL JUDGMENT, AND ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

BY THOMAS BALDWIN THAYER, D.D.

BOSTON:
UNIVERSALIST PUBLISHING HOUSE.
1891.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1862, by
TOMPKINS AND COMPANY,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

PRESSWORK BY JOHN WILSON AND SON,
UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BX
9941
.T5
1891

PREFACE.

THE title page and table of contents sufficiently indicate the general character and object of this work. It is only necessary to mention two or three special features.

First: It embodies in *one volume* the views of the denomination on all the leading doctrines of Christian Theology, and an exposition of the more important words and phrases supposed to conflict with these views. It thus furnishes a comprehensive answer, within reach of all, to the question—*What is Universalism?* And it is to be hoped that the answer to it is in such form as to meet the wants of all classes of readers, and to command respectful attention from the Theologian and the Scholar.

Second: It aims to show that Universalism is not a confused collection of doctrinal fragments, without continuity or relation of parts; but a system of divinity, a tree of life rooted in the character and perfections of Deity, and growing up naturally into trunk and branches, putting forth leaves, and buds, and blossoms, and finally producing the ripe fruit of a Christian life. And as the Divine character and perfections constitute the foundation of the entire argument, and the basis of all theological reasoning, a correspondingly large space has been devoted to this theme.

Third: There will be found introduced into the text and notes, liberal quotations from Fathers of the early Church; the object being to call attention to the fact, so little recognized, that the

doctrines of the Church immediately subsequent to the time of Christ and his apostles, are largely identical with the Universalism of to-day—and that, therefore, it is not a new thing, but certainly as old as the Christian Church and the New Testament.

Fourth: Citations are also occasionally given from the popular authors of the day, and from teachers of all Christian communions; wherein they have expressed their rejection of the doctrine of endless punishment, or their faith in the final restoration This is done for the purpose of showing that this faith alone feeds the great hunger of the human heart; or, as *Olshausen* says, that "the feeling is deeply rooted in noble minds, and is the expression of a heartfelt desire for a perfect harmony of the creation." The testimonies reveal the fact that belief in this final harmony of the moral universe, or a tendency to belief, is the natural fruitage of large and liberal study, of a generous literary and scientific culture.

It is only justice to the author to add, that it is not pretended that the volume is a thorough treatise on the various subjects discussed; but an attempt only to indicate the way, and to show their natural and dogmatic relations. And though it is not all that was wished or sought, he sends it forth with a prayer for the divine approval and blessing; and with an humble hope that it may be useful in promoting among men the knowledge, and love, and practice of the truth.

Boston, Nov., 1862.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY 11

CHAPTER I.—GOD AND HIS ATTRIBUTES. 15

SECTION I.—God the Creator — Existence of Evil: I. Physical Evils; II. Evils of Ignorance; III. Moral Evil 16

SECT. II.—The Wisdom of God — The Plan of Creation 32

SECT. III.—The Power of God — Omnipotence: I. Moral and Spiritual, as well as Physical; II. Freedom of the Human Will, or "Free Agency" 41

SECT. IV.—The Goodness of God—Infinite and Unchangeable .. 58

SECT. V.—The Justice of God: I. What is Justice, and what does it demand? II. Justice has claims on God as well as on man 70

SECT. VI.—God the Father of all men 89

CHAPTER II.—CHRIST—HIS NATURE, OFFICE, DEATH AND ATONEMENT.

SECTION I.—His exalted character and pre-existence—The Trinity, evidences for and against it 103

SECT. II.—The Atonement, what it is, and how we are reconciled and saved by the Death of Christ 123

SECT. III.—The death of Christ not vicarious — Argument from the Epistle to the Hebrews: I. Christ a sacrifice for sin; II. Our Passover; III. Our Ransom; IV. Redeems us from the curse of the Law; V. Bears our griefs, is wounded for our trangressions 136

CHAPTER III.—MAN—THE RECTITUDE OF HIS NATURE—ORIGINAL SIN—NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

SECTION I.—The teaching of the Bible and the Early Church respecting man's moral ability 141

SECT. II.—Special proofs of the Rectitude of Human Nature.. 154

SECT. III.—Criticism of texts cited in proof of Natural Depravity —"The wicked estranged from the womb"—"Shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin"—"Every imagination of the heart evil continually"—"Children of wrath by nature"—"The natural man"—"The carnal mind" 161

CHAPTER IV.—THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION, OR THE NEW BIRTH—CONVERSION—WATER BAPTISM. 167

SECTION I.—Born again—Born of God—Born of the Spirit.... 168

SECT. II.—Regeneration—New Creature—New Man—Giving a New Heart—Creating in Christ Jesus—Quickening from the Dead—§ Water Baptism..... 179

CHAPTER V.—SALVATION, WHAT IT IS—THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE. 188

SECTION I.—Direct Scriptural Testimony respecting the nature of Salvation 191

SECT. II.—Figures and Metaphors illustrating the nature of Salvation: I. We are refined as Silver; II. We are Cleansed and Washed; III. We are healed as of a Disease; IV. Christ our Teacher; V. We are found as the lost—All not saved in this life—Ancient Universalism on this point..... 197

CHAPTER VI.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

SECTION I.—The Resurrection a Moral an Spiritual, as well as a Bodily change 207

SECT. II.—"Every man in his own order."..... 220

SECT. III.—"Then cometh the end." 226

SECT. IV.—Death—Resurrection—Salvation—Their relation to each other..... 233

CHAPTER VII.—THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT DEFINITIONS. 245

SECTION I.—God judging the world under the Old Dispensation 246

SECT. II.—Judgment of the world by Christ under the New Dispensation: I. Time and place of Judgment—When the Judgment day began; II. The Judgment spiritual, by the word of truth, and not literal or in person; III. The end of the Judgment Day, and the results of the Judgment — Opinions of Ancient Universalists..... 251

SECT. III—The Judgment after Death, Heb. ix. 27..... 266

CHAPTER VIII.—THE DOCTRINE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS.

SECTION I.—The Rewards of Righteousness 273

SECT. II.—The Punishments of Sin—The Law and its Penalties: I. The design of the Law; II. The design of the Penalty 286

SECT. III.—The Remedial Nature of Punishment—Testimony of the Scriptures—The teaching of Ancient Universalism 291

SECT. IV.—The present a state of Retribution, and not of Probation: I. The argument of facts and experience; II. Argument from the Bible 302

CHAPTER IX.—REPENTANCE AND FORGIVENESS IN RELATION TO PUNISHMENT AND SALVATION. 313

CHAPTER X.—THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF DAMNATION.

SECTION I.—Definition and usage of the original words..... 321

SECT. II.—"Resurrection of Damnation"—"Awaking to shame and everlasting contempt"..... 329

CHAPTER XI.—MEANING AND USAGE OF THE WORDS TRANSLATED "EVERLASTING," "ETERNAL," "FOREVER," &C.

SECTION I.—Classic usage and Lexicography—Aristotle's famous Definition of *Aion* 337

SECT. II.—Jewish-Greek usage—Philo, Josephus..... 346

SECT. III.—Usage of Church Fathers..... 348

SECT. IV—Scriptural usage—Everlasting, as applied to the Life of the Righteous and the Punishment of the Wicked. Matt. xxv. 46..... 351

CHAPTER XII.—THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE CONCERNING HELL.

SECTION I.—*Sheol*, or the Hell of the Old Testament—"The wicked shall be turned into hell."—Endless punishment not taught in the Law of Moses—Confessions of Theologians and Biblical Scholars.... 362

SECT. II.—*Hades*, of the New Testament—Its meaning and usage—"The Rich Man and Lazarus." 371

SECT. III.—*Gehenna*—Origin and usage of the word—Was it used as a symbol of future punishment in the time of Christ?—I. The Septuagint; II. The Apocrypha; III. Philo and Josephus; IV. The Targums. "Destruction of soul and body in Hell."..... 384

SECT. IV.—*Tartarus*—Meaning and usage—"The angels cast down to hell"—The Book of Enoch quoted by Peter and Jude—The story of the angels 399

CHAPTER XIII.—THE ORIGIN AND USAGE OF METAPHORS AND FIGURES OF SPEECH, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THEIR USE IN THE BIBLE.

SECTION I.—Origin and use of Metaphors 406

SECT. II.—Scriptural Metaphors relating to the Deity—All language more or less figurative 409

SECT. III.—Metaphors derived from local customs, occupations and opinions 415

SECT. IV.—Metaphors and Figures derived from natural objects and phenomena 422

INTRODUCTORY.

All religions are founded upon a belief in a Deity, of some kind, superior in nature, or in power, to man. The moral force and value of any religion, in its influence on the believer, is in proportion to the degree of perfection which it ascribes to the Deity. Aristotle has somewhere said, in substance, that excellency in man depends on his acquaintance with something higher and better than himself; and the whole course of religious history illustrates the truth of the observation.

Where the religion is really believed, and exercises its legitimate influence on the believer, the moral and social results correspond to the character of the theology. "If the divinities," says a judicious writer, "are represented as virtuous and noble, a corresponding excellence and greatness of soul, will be produced among the people, and this in proportion to their reverence for the objects of their adoration. But wherever the gods are imperfect or base, imperfection or baseness will belong to the worshippers."

No other result can be looked for where the faith of the people is a living force in them, and acts directly on their feelings, character, and conduct. Hence it has been justly affirmed, that "religion will not be-

come the friend of virtue and happiness, until it teaches that the Deity is not only an inconceivably powerful, but also an inconceivably wise and good being; that for this reason, he gives way neither to anger nor revenge, and never punishes capriciously; that we owe to his favor alone, all the good that we possess or enjoy; that even our sufferings contribute to our highest good, and death is a bitter, but salutary change; in fine, that the sacrifice most acceptable to God, consists in a mind that seeks for truth, and a heart that always preserves its purity. A religion which announces these exalted truths, offers to man, the strongest preservatives from vice, and the strongest motives to virtue, exalts and enobles his joys, consoles and guides him in all kinds of misfortune, and inspires him with forbearance, patience, and active benevolence towards his brethren." [1]

This is a noble utterance; and the religion thus described, is precisely the want of the world at the present time. Everywhere the soul of man is reaching out toward a Deity, in whom is embodied this perfection of wisdom and goodness, of justice and mercy. In the language of Channing, it is the deepest want of human nature, "some being to whom we may give our hearts, whom we may love more than ourselves, for whom we may live, and be ready to die; and whose character corresponds to that idea of perfection, which, however dim and undefined, is an essential element of every human soul. We cannot be happy beyond our love. . . . . To secure a growing

[1] See an excellent article, conceived in a liberal spirit, on the "Character and Theology of the early Romans," in the *Biblical Repository* for April, 1843.

happiness and a spotless virtue, we need for the heart a being worthy of the whole treasure of its love, to whom we may consecrate our whole existence; in approaching whom, we enter an atmosphere of purity and brightness, in sympathizing with whom, we cherish only noble sentiments, in devoting ourselves to whom, we espouse great and enduring interests; in whose character we find the spring of an ever-enlarging philanthrophy, and by attachment to whom all our other attachments are hallowed, protected, and supplied with tender and sublime consolations under bereavement and blighted hope. Such a being is God."[1]

This is essentially the theology of Universalism, the character and action which, following the sacred Scriptures, it ascribes to God as the Supreme Governor of the universe, and the Creator and Father of men. In him are united all possible perfections; and by the necessity of his nature, he is infinite in all his attributes, and unchangeable—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. He is the source of all our blessings, the inexhaustible fountain of good to man in this world, and in all worlds, in time, and in eternity.

This doctrine of the complete harmony and perfection of all the divine attributes, of the infinite benevolence of God in the creation and government of the world, inspires the true believer with reverent trust, with devout gratitude, and with an earnest desire to conform to all the requirements of his righteous laws. It imparts courage in the presence of danger, resistance in the time of temptation, patience in tribula-

[1] Works, vol. i. p. 204.

tion, resignation in suffering, and peace in the hour of death. The experience of these beneficent influences, and the happy consciousness of this spiritual renewal, justify the Universalist Christian in claiming for his faith, that it has all the characteristics of a divinely authenticated religion; that it is, in a word, identical with the Gospel as taught by the Saviour and his chosen disciples.

In order to the better understanding of this doctrine, and in evidence of the justness of this claim, we shall proceed to a statement of particulars, setting forth our views on the great questions of Christian theology; and the system, or method, of Scriptural interpretation, by which these views are sustained and enforced. And as the starting point, the foundation of all argument, we shall begin with the Creator and his attributes, or the divine character and action as they relate to man and his destiny; and though we shall chiefly direct our labors to a dogmatic or doctrinal statement of the subjects in hand, yet the careful reader will readily discover how the doctrine naturally and necessarily leads on to the precept; and in what manner faith is developed into moral character, and becomes the spiritual force which regulates and blesses the life of the believer.

CHAPTER I.

GOD — HIS ATTRIBUTES, AND THEIR RELATION TO HUMAN DESTINY.

The very idea of existence implies certain powers and qualities. Spiritual existence involves spiritual and moral qualities or attributes. God is a Spirit; and his moral attributes, his spiritual perfections, constitute his character, and determine his action.

If he is infinitely good, if the essence of his being is Love, all his actions will partake of this quality. If he is supreme in power, he will act without restraint or hindrance. If he is all-wise, or omniscient, he cannot err in judgment, or make any mistake in his plans, or fail in his purposes through want of knowledge or foresight, as to the results of anything he might do. If he is infinitely just, all his dealings with his creatures will be marked by perfect equity; and he will require nothing but what is right and possible, and will lay no evil or penalty on man but what is consistent with eternal rectitude. If he is above all perturbations, all weakness and passion, above the disturbing influences of evil and sin; then he will never act from anger or revenge, never will do anything to, or with, his creatures, save from the dictates of infinite and unchangeable benevolence.

These general statements necessarily involve the conclusion of triumphant universal good, as the result

of the creation and government of the world by God. The very act of creation is virtually a pledge of this; and all his attributes unite in the accomplishment of this great purpose of Infinite Beneficence.

A more particular review of the relations of God as Creator, and as a Father, and of the divine perfections, with specific reference to the act of giving existence to man, will illustrate and establish this position.

SECTION I.

GOD THE CREATOR — EXISTENCE OF EVIL.

It would be to little purpose to inquire whether God could not have created this world without evil or imperfection of any sort; whether he could not have made man in such a way, physically and morally, as to have secured him against the possibility of sin. The fact that he has not done this meets us on the threshold of our inquiry; and it is with this fact that we have to deal, aided by the light of reason and the authoritative revelations of the Bible.

For aught we know, God may have created somewhere in infinite space a world without evil, peopled by a race of beings morally perfect. But even if this were so, it would remain to be proved that *this* world, and man as we find him here, imperfect and subject to evil, do not constitute a link in the endless chain of being, without which it would be incomplete, without which even heaven itself would lose a measure of its harmony and fulness. The philosophical poet has spoken well on this interesting point:

> "Of systems possible, if 'tis confest
> That Wisdom Infinite must form the best,

Where all must full or not coherent be,
And all that rise, must rise in due degree,
Then in the scale of reasoning life, 'tis plain,
There must be somewhere such a rank as man."

And then, in answer to the question so often started, "Why could not man have been created perfect, without liability to sin? why was he not placed higher in the scale of being — why not made an angel?" he proceeds as follows:

"Presumptuous man, wouldst thou the reason find
Why made so weak, so little, and so blind?
First, if thou canst, the harder reason guess,
Why made no weaker, blinder and no less —
Ask of thy mother earth why oaks are made
Taller and stronger than the weeds they shade.
On superior powers
Were we to press, inferior might on ours;
Or in the full creation leave a void,
Where one step broken, the great scale's destroyed.
From nature's chain whatever link you strike,
Tenth, or ten-thousandth, breaks the chain alike."

Admitting, therefore, what, perhaps, no one is prepared to deny, that God *can* create a relatively perfect world, or a world not liable to evil, and people it with a race of perfect beings not liable to sin: *this* world may, nevertheless, hold as important and necessary a place in creation as that. Nay, it may be that without just such a world as this, inhabited by just such beings as men, the whole machinery of the universe, as at present arranged, would be imperfect in its structure and working. Manifestly this earth, with its myriad immortal intelligences, is not formed without a purpose. Without these, the space which they fill in the circle of organic and spiritual existence would be blank; and there would be one link wanting in the golden chain of being which stretches, on

either side of us, to the infinite above, and the infinite below.

The fact that man was made relatively imperfect, that is, imperfect in the sense of liability to sin, is proved by the fact that he is a sinner. He was not created a sinner, for sin is the result of voluntary action. He was not created depraved, but pure and innocent. He yielded to temptation, and so fell away from his primal innocence into transgression. The author of Ecclesiastes states the case very correctly and tersely, when he says, "Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." viii. 29.

That this constitution of man and its consequences entered into the original plan of the Creator, and is not an after accident, or an unlooked for result, is distinctly stated by the apostle Paul in his epistle to the Romans: "The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." viii. 20, 21. See the whole chapter.

Now here we are certified in the most unqualified terms, that the creature man, or the human race, *was made* subject to vanity or imperfection, for wise and beneficent reasons; and with express reference to the fact that, when the purposes of this subjection to evil are fully accomplished, then man is to be delivered from the bondage of corruption and death into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Whatever may be thought of this position of Paul, there can be no difference of opinion as to what he meant, or what

he intended to say. It is clear enough that he believed and taught that we were subjected to this imperfect condition by the Creator himself. It was designed in the beginning for a special purpose; and has not, since then, come to pass contrary to his expectations. Bishop Bloomfield renders the passage in this form: "For the world (i. e. God's creatures) was made subject to imperfection, corruption and misery (not by any will of its own, but by Him who thus subjected it), yet with a hope (on their part) that this very creation (i. e. these his creatures) will be delivered from the bondage of corruption, &c. Corruption may perhaps be meant to be taken both in a moral and physical sense, to denote both liability to sin, and to disease and death." Of course, then, "vanity" must be taken to mean the same things, for the words are plainly synonymous, and refer to the same condition; the creature being delivered from the same thing to which it was subjected; in the one case called "vanity," and in the other "corruption."[1]

It is plain, then, that God, as the Creator of mankind, when he determined upon the nature of their physical and moral condition on earth, determined

[1] Ματαιότης, *vanity*, occurs in only two other passages of the New Testament. Eph. iv. 17, "in the vanity of their mind;" where the moral element is manifestly involved, as verses 19 and 22 plainly show —"lasciviousness and all uncleanness with greediness;" and 2 Peter ii, 18, where the same statement applies, as the next words show—"lusts of the flesh and wantonness." Φθορα, *corruption*, is found not only in 1 Cor. xv., but also in such passages as these: "having escaped the corruption that is in the world," "servants of corruption," 2 Peter i. & ii., illustrating its use in a moral as well as in a physical sense. Whitby and others argue elaborately for the corruption of death as the only meaning of "vanity."

that it should be such as involved the liability to physical and moral evil; and, consequently, as the apostle says, he "*made* man subject to vanity," or imperfection. He "*subjected*" him to this condition, with a clear foresight and intention respecting all the trials and sorrows, the spiritual conflicts and temptations, the failures and conquests, as well as the decay and destruction by death of the mortal body, which this constitution of things would naturally bring in its train.

But, of course, all this was with a view to the greater good that is to come of it. This condition was not ordained for its own sake, as a permanent thing; but as a means to a beneficent and glorious end, as a school wherein we are to be taught and trained for a higher sphere of life and action, both in the present and in the future. Dr. Jonathan Edwards, who was regarded as the highest authority in theological metaphysics, says, with great good sense, in his famous work on the Will: — "I believe there is no person of good understanding, who will venture to say he is certain that it is impossible it should be best, taking in the whole compass and extent of existence, and all consequences in the endless series of events, that there should be such a thing as moral evil in the world. And if so, it will certainly follow that an infinitely wise Being, who always chooses what is best, must choose that there be such a thing." Again, he says: — "It is not of a bad tendency for the Supreme Being thus to order and permit that moral evil to be which it is best should come to pass; for that it is of good tendency is the very thing supposed in the point in question, ... and good is the actual issue in the final result of things."

Turnbull, in his "Principles of Moral Philosophy," which Edwards quotes approvingly, states that "God intends and pursues *the universal good of his creation;* and the evil which happens is not permitted for its own sake, but because it is requisite to the greater good pursued." [1]

And if we give a little attention to the details of the question, it will not be very difficult to discover how the conflict with the imperfections and evils of

[1] And with these agree the following Unitarian testimonies:—"The origin of our *liability* to sin, we can explain only by referring it to the will of our Maker." Again:—"We hold that God is master of evil, not merely physical but moral—master of his creation, and able to *overrule all evil for moral good*, so that at last, when his work is consummated, *the good shall be triumphant and complete.*"

I think it would be difficult to show that the above premises of Edwards and Turnbull do not involve the conclusion which it is the purpose of this volume to establish. If "good is the actual issue in the final result of things," of moral evil or sin, in one case, why not in all cases? The principle is the same; and it surely is as easy for God to realize a great result as a little one. And if, in the permission of evil, "God intends and pursues the universal good of his creation," there seems an end of the argument; for if he intends and pursues it, he will certainly accomplish it, and the good of the whole can only be accomplished in the good of each particular part. Bishop Warburton, who could not believe in endless punishment, says, very truly:—"Though the system of the best supposes that the evils themselves will be fully compensated by the good they produce to the whole, yet this is so far from supposing that particulars shall suffer for a general good, that it is essential to this system, to conclude that at the completion of things, when the whole is arrived to the state of utmost perfection, *particular and universal good shall coincide.*" And commenting on Rev. xx. 14, "death and hell cast into the lake of fire," he says:—"The sense of the whole seems to be this, that at the consummation of things (the subject here treated of), *all physical and moral evil shall be abolished.*"

For the quotations, see Edwards on the Will, Part iv., Sec. ix., or Works, vol. ii., p. 254, Edit. 1829. Turnbull's Philosophy, vol. ii., pp. 42, 35, 37. Christian Examiner, numbers for Nov., 1853, and March, 1861. Warburton's Works, vols. xi., 26—30; v. 407

our lot serves to develope the faculties of body and mind, to strengthen and build up the character; how, in fact, all evil finally takes on some shape of good, and thus vindicates the divine wisdom in subjecting man to "vanity." To begin with the lowest form of the subject:—

I. *Physical Evils.*—We may safely say that our usefulness and happiness are largely dependant on the development of all our powers and gifts, physical, mental, and spiritual. For accomplishing this, there must, of course, be occasion for that action of which this development is the legitimate result. But, if there were no evil connected with our present condition and estate, how could this be? Where the occasion for activity or exertion, if man were free from evil, and already as perfect as he is capable of being? And if you leave him one step this side of perfection, you involve him in the necessary evil of imperfection. But if perfect in all respects, what moving cause would there be for action? He has no wants to gratify; no enjoyment to obtain; no inconvenience to be rid of; no work to perform; no end to seek or gain; no occasion, whatever, for the slightest exertion of body or mind. The propelling power would be gone to a great degree, and life would become as a still and stagnant pool, covered over with its green and slimy coating, unbroken by the winds of heaven, or the dip of a passing wing.

Take one example only. If there were no hunger; if man had been so constituted as never to want food, then there would have been no room for the activity, both of mind and body, which is now devoted to procuring this. The noble science of agriculture, which

is so rapidly unfolding the powers of the earth and the elements, and bringing us so constantly into the presence of infinite wisdom and benevolence, would have no being. The constant hum of business and enterprise heard all over the earth, and the wonderful and complicated movements connected with the supply of this one universal want, would cease at once. The far-stretching fields of grain, rich and ripe, waving in the wind, and adding such beauty to the landscape, and giving such joy to the heart of the beholder — the mill, with the noise of its grinding, and the wild merriment of its whirling wheels and rushing waters — the pleasant garden-spot, with its various vegetable productions, and the satisfaction of cultivating and watching over it — the groves of delicious fruit, planted by the hand of man in every clime — the proud ship, that bears its freight of blessings from shore to shore — the canal, the rail-road, the steamship, the magnetic telegraph, — all these would be struck out of existence; and the thousands who are engaged in these manifold employments, and find a life and joy in the activity they afford, would fall back into a dead silence and listlessness, and all would become a complete and thorough blank in the place of that quick life and cheerful industry, which are born of this want or evil, and those kindred to it.

II. *Intellectual Evils, or the Evils of Ignorance.*— That ignorance of the government and works of God, gnorance of the truths of science, of the laws of organized life, and of the physical universe, is the source of much evil, of accident and suffering, no one can, or is disposed to, deny. But suppose there were no ig-

norance in regard to these things; suppose God had, when he created man, thoroughly instructed him in all the sciences; and imparted to him, by direct miracle or revelation, a complete knowledge of all the laws of the physical world. It is true, you might in this way, get quit of all the suffering, of all the evil consequent upon ignorance; but would you not also annihilate all the mental action and effort consequent upon it?

If the Creator had given to man in the beginning, by inspiration or revelation, a knowledge of all the sublime and beautiful truths of astronomy, chemistry, geology, physiology, political science, natural philosophy, and all other departments of human knowledge—then all the labor of mind, the splendid intellectual triumphs by which these truths have been unfolded, and which have thrilled all souls that have witnessed their success, with admiration and joy — all this activity and consequent happiness had never been. And we had not known, as now, how glorious a creature the human mind is; how manifold its powers and resources; how heroically it will struggle against difficulties, till it rise up into the heavens, victorious over all, and reverently, yet without trembling, stand at last in the presence of the Eternal One!

But not only this. With the loss of these efforts and triumphs, must be numbered also the countless books written on these subjects; the glorious printing-press, giving wings to knowledge and truth; the beautiful and exquisite instruments with which science has wrought out her discoveries; and all the study and industry consequent upon them — all these must perish with the evils of ignorance; or rather, but for

the evils of ignorance they could have had no existence. All the truths of science and art known to us, there would be no use for them — no call for mental effort to invent, or mechanical labor to execute.

If, then, there is any happiness in the discovery of truth, and the increase of knowledge, if any measure of our blessedness lies in the development and perfection of the intellect, all which necessarily involve the existence of previous ignorance and imperfection — then, just to this extent, we are furnished with a solution of the great problem of evil; or, at least, we see some of the important uses which evil may subserve. And now let us turn to—

III. *Moral Evil.* If there had been no error or sin in the world, we should have known nothing of Jesus the Christ, that loftiest exhibition of perfected humanity, that single bright star in the mingled firmament of earth and heaven, whose light was never dimmed. We should have known nothing of his deeds of love and mercy in return for hate and cruelty; nothing of that life of his, always so serene and beautiful amid the storms of temptation and bigotry and persecution, and closed at last with that sublime prayer of forgiveness and blessing, the very record of which even now thrills the souls of the millions with unutterable emotions of reverence and joy. And so one of the most instructive pages in the history of humanity would have been left totally blank, with not a single bright word of heaven's language to catch the eye, or quicken the thought.

And of God, also — if there were no sin, we should lose sight of half the glory of his character, and of the

beautiful and tender relations which he sustains to us. We should know him as a God of almighty power, of infinite wisdom, of perfect holiness; but of his saving grace, of his mercy, of his patient and watchful care for his wayward children, of his long-suffering and pardoning love, of his blessed promises of redemption — if there were no moral evil, no error nor sin, what should we know of these glorious exhibitions of the divine character? How could they have been at all? How could we have loved and adored, in spirit and understanding, the affectionate Father and the perfect God, as we love and adore him now?[1]

But there is another phase to this question of moral evil, which deserves a thought. It will be allowed very readily, that the virtues of charity, forgiveness, generosity, self-sacrifice, faith, fidelity, are of great worth, and give the highest grace and beauty to the character. All will agree that without these noble virtues, it would become tame and spiritless, with scarcely a single trait to waken our admiration, or call forth our reverence and love. The lively and animated picture of the soul's struggles and triumphs, would lose its richest coloring and finish; and life itself would be without point, without any useful or elevating aim.

But if man had been created perfect, and never had fallen into any kind of sin, how could these virtues have birth or being? If there were nothing to try our patience or our love, how could the worth

[1] JONATHAN EDWARDS says, "God does not will sin as sin, or for the sake of any thing evil; though it be his pleasure so to order things, that, he permitting, sin will come to pass, *for the sake of the great good that by his disposal shall be the consequence.*" Works, vol. ii., 254. Edition 1829.

and truth of them be proved? If none offended against us, how could we forgive? If none did us evil, how could we obey the greatest of the divine requisitions, "Return good for evil?" If there were no want nor sorrow, if there were no injustice nor wrong, where would be the noble examples of charity and mercy, of generosity and self-forgetfulness, which have adorned the history of the world, and moved multitudes of souls with admiring joy, and sent them forth with inspiration for the same blessed work? If there were no sorrow nor pain, where had been those heavenly lessons of patient love, of affectionate devotion, under sternest trials? where had been that sweet submission to God, that serene peace, that divine strength, which the frailest child of suffering has at times manifested? leaving a witness, before which the strongest and most unwilling have bowed; and, through the power of which, the humblest and weakest have felt themselves lifted up to new courage and faith.

If, then, these virtues are of any worth; if charity, forgiveness, resignation, faith, self-sacrifice, have any value in themselves, or as examples to the world; if they adorn the human character, and are necessary to the perfect development of the human heart, then here again is a reason why the Creator did not make man perfect in the begining, but determined rather to leave him to perfect himself through toil and struggle, through defeat and victory, through obedience, and self-conquest, and faith, and love, aided and blessed by the Holy Spirit — another reason why he subjected him to temporal evil, that he might, through this, work out for himself an abiding, ever-

lasting good. And Paul alludes to this view of the subject, in immediate connection with the passage already quoted, saying, with exultant emphasis:— "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time, are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us."— Rom. viii. 18. And he repeats the thought in his second letter to the Corinthians, in yet more definite and nervous phrase:— "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day; for our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," iv. 16, 17.

And doubtless one purpose of our present condition of mingled evil and good, is to lead us up to the thought of and desire for this "eternal weight of glory, which shall be revealed in us." If there were no evil here, no vanity or imperfection, no drawback of any sort connected with the things of this life, we should cling to them always, and never look higher, nor desire anything better. Earth would become our heaven, the world our god, and our life the life merely of the animal.

But now the temptations, and sins, and failures, and sorrows, the unsatisfying character of our pursuits and pleasures, the perishable nature of earthly possessions — in a word, "the vanity and vexation of spirit" which wait on all worldly things reveal to us that this is not our home, that these are not all God has in store for us. They lead us when sick at heart and dissatisfied, even though our highest ambitions are gratified; when weary with our struggles against evil, and disheartened with the ills of life — these

very ills and disappointments call up within us irrepressible longings and yearnings for, and point us forward to, something nobler and better than anything this world can give: something that will not betray our trust, nor defeat our hopes; something imperishable and eternal.[1]

> "For, from the birth
> Of mortal man, the sovereign Maker said,
> That not in humble, nor in brief delight;
> Not in the fading glories of renown,
> Power's purple robes, nor pleasure's flowery lap,
> The soul should find enjoyment, but from these
> Turning disdainful to an eternal good,
> Through all the ascent of things enlarge her view,
> Till every bound at length should disappear,
> *And infinite perfection close the scene!*"[2]

But then of course this disciplinary result of evil depends entirely upon the fact that all *shall* end well, "and infinite perfection close the scene." It all turns on the truth that evil *is* temporal, as Paul says, and that these light afflictions *are* comparatively but for a moment. Deliberately to plan, purpose, ordain and perpetuate this "vanity," or evil of any kind, as an end, for its own sake, is too monstrous to admit of defence. The only possible method of vindicating the existing order of things, is on the Bible ground, viz: that it is a means and not an end; that it is a course of training, education and growth, preparatory to something higher; that the battle is to terminate in victory, and present imperfection, sin and suffering,

[1] "And their longing for a future perfection is shared by *all created beings, whose discontent at present imperfection points to another state freed from evil.*"—CONYBEARE & HOWSON'S Life and Epistles of St. Paul, vol. ii. 175. Marginal notes to Rom. viii. 17.

[2] Akenside's "Pleasures of Imagination."

to give place to future perfection, holiness, and joy.[1]

And the argument applies equally to all; for if all were "*made*" subject to "vanity," then all have an equal claim to deliverance from its bondage. And this is the position of the inspired Apostle; for he distinctly asserts that the same "creature" subjected, viz. the human creature, the entire race of mankind, shall be delivered.[2] And the accomplishment of this grand result is the purpose, and prophesied completion, of the Saviour's mission, as revealed in the apocalyptic vision touching the New Jerusalem: "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." Rev. xxi.

Thus do we see that the "vanity" and "bondage" of the present state, are prophetic of "the glorious

[1] WILLIAM LAW, who was a Universalist, and the author of the "Serious Call" and "Christian Perfection," works greatly prized by the orthodox sects, says on this point: "*As for the purification of all human nature*, I fully believe it, either in this world, or some after ages. And as to that of angels, if it is possible, I am glad of it, and also sure enough that it will then come to pass." *Letters*, Letter xii., London edition, 1762. Southey, in his life of Wesley, states Laws's theological views in detail, including his belief that "all beings will finally be happy." Vol. i. p. 216, Harper's edit.

[2] WHITBY says "the creature" means "the whole race of men," "all the world;" MACKNIGHT says, "every human creature," "all mankind," &c.; BLOOMFIELD, "the human race;" LASPIS, "the universal world" (*universum mundum*). The universality of meaning in both members of the proposition, is admitted on all hands.

liberty" of the future. The temporal evil is but the herald of everlasting good; and the very imperfection, physical and moral, of the earthly constitution of things, is suggestive of change; the pledge, in fact, of that final beatified condition which is "without variableness" or the shadow of change. This infant school of our being, where with much effort, with many failures and repetitions, we slowly learn the A, B, C, of life's lessons, points with unerring finger to the University of Heaven, where, our spiritual education completed, we enter upon the glories and the delights of the life immortal.

To this result the character of God as a wise and beneficent Creator, and all the divine attributes of Power, Wisdom, Goodness and Justice, stand committed. It is the only solution of the vexed problem of evil. It is the only satisfactory exposition of the purpose of God's creation. And, finally, it is the only doctrine which equally vindicates his perfection, honors his government, and challenges the admiration, the worship, the confidence and affection of all his intelligent creatures.

That this statement rests on a sure foundation, with abundant evidence in its support, will be verified by the arguments of the following sections, shewing that the attributes of Deity, in their active relation to the work of creation, do by their very nature involve and pledge this ultimate result.

SECTION II.

THE WISDOM OF GOD — THE PLAN OF CREATION.

In the use of the word "wisdom" in this connection, which is more popular than precise, we mean chiefly knowledge—knowledge of all things and all events; knowledge which embraces all possibilities, and excludes all contingencies. This is a necessary element in the character of Deity—a part of his essence. We cannot take away the attribute of omniscience, and leave the idea of God and the Creator perfect. All things are of God; creation is but the out-birth of his thought and action; all events flow from causes which his will has set in motion—and, therefore, of necessity, he knows all things as the original cause of all things.

This fact is recognized everywhere in the Bible, in such passages among others as these:—"Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world."—Acts xv. 18. "Great is the Lord, and of great power; his understanding is infinite."—Ps. cxlvii. 5. "He is perfect in knowledge." . . . . "With him is strength and wisdom; the deceiver and the deceived are his."—Ps. xxii., xxvi. "Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure."—Isa. xlvi. 10. "For thou, even thou only knowest the hearts of all the children of men."—1 Kings viii. 39. "For I know their works and their thoughts: it shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues; and they shall

come and see my glory."—Isa. lxvi. 18. "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do."—Heb. iv. 13. "Doth not he see my way, and count all my steps? . . . . For his eyes are on the ways of man, and he seeth all his goings. . . . . Therefore, he knoweth their works and overturneth them."—Job xxxi., xxxiv. "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good."—Prov. xv. 3. "Thou understandest my thought afar off (*i. e.* before it has fairly reached me, or come into my own mind), and art acquainted with all my ways. There is not a word in my tongue, but lo! O Lord, thou knowest it altogether."—Ps. cxxxix. "Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth, I tell you of them."—Isa. xlii. 9.

These passages set forth the doctrine of God's omniscience in clearest terms. The past, the present, and the future, are all one to him, as the darkness and the light are one. The future cannot hide from him any more than the darkness. Eternity cannot teach him anything new.

There can be no additions to his knowledge, by the occurrence of events which he did not foresee or anticipate; events or results which were not embraced in his original plan. Nothing can come to pass by the action of causes outside of himself, causes independent of his will, and self-creative.

Both the character of God as sole Creator, as the Alpha and Omega of the universe, and the Scriptures as the authorized exponent of his attributes, establish

beyond controversy, the fact that all things are known unto him from the beginning to the end. He knows what is to be; and he shows this knowledge in the spirit of prophecy, by foretelling the events before they come to pass. He knows the thoughts and purposes of the hearts of all the children of men, the evil and the good; marks all their ways, counts their steps, and numbers the very hairs of their heads. Every thing, thought, word, desire, action, event, lies open, naked before his all-seeing eye; from the establishment of a solar system, or the destruction of a nation, down to the idle word, or the heart-pulse of the obscurest mortal on earth; yea, down to the least interests of the invisible animalcule. "His understanding is infinite; he is perfect in knowledge."

The logical deductions from these divinely authorized premises, are obvious to every one who has given any thought to the subject. The Divine Knowledge embraces the future and final condition of every soul of man, and did embrace it from the beginning, as a part and portion of the original plan of God, inherent in the very purpose and end had in view in the creation of man.

Let us consider this well. Far back in the solitudes of eternity, neither man nor the earth had an existence. It was entirely optional with God, whether he would or not, shape this earth, and set it running through its orbit; whether he would or not, create such a being as man, and put him here to live out his threescore years and ten. There was no power nor influence outside of his own choice, to compel him to create He was perfectly free to do, or leave undone.

But he chose to do; he determined to create just such a world as we are living in, and just such a race of creatures as mankind. Of course, he did not do this without a motive, without some specific object in view, and some clearly defined plan, or method, by which this object was to be obtained. He could not foreordain the end, without a foreordination of the means necessary to it. We cannot suppose he began the work of creation, as the man of the parable began to build his house, without counting the cost, or considering whether he were able to finish or not.

Let us now take the case of a single soul, and follow it through its various experiences to the close of its earthly course, and its entrance upon the scenes of its future and final destiny. By the will of God this soul exists. Why did he bring it into being? Was it from caprice or sudden impulse, without a motive or a plan, without knowing what he should do with it, or what was to become of it? Or, did he enter upon the solemn work of giving existence to this immortal creature, for a good and satisfactory reason, knowing perfectly what he was doing, seeing into all the future of its life in time and eternity, having a distinct and settled purpose in regard to its destination, and having all the agencies appointed and arranged, by which this purpose was to be accomplished?

Certainly this last. The very idea of infinite goodness, of unerring and all-comprehensive wisdom, compels to this conclusion. Of course, then, it follows, that in creating this soul with a specific end in view, with a pre-determined object to be realized, he would endow it with reference to this end and ob-

ject. Whatever moral powers and faculties, whatever physical passions and propensities, whatever strength or weakness, knowledge or ignorance, entered into the organization of this being, it would be with a perfect foresight of their operative relations to the plan with which, or the specific destiny for which, he was created. All his attributes of spirit and body, all his intellectual and moral qualities, would be harmonized with this plan. Nothing would be allowed to enter into his composition, which would work to the defeat of this plan. This is implied in the very notion or conception of plan. He would not create this immortal being for a foreordained destiny, and then endow him with moral and mental qualities, which he distinctly saw would, and of course, therefore, intended should, forever prevent it from realizing that destiny!

Let us have this in a more definite form. "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably determined, and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished."

Now suppose the soul, whose case is under review, was one of the number "foreordained to everlasting death;" suppose God had, at the time of its creation, purposed and pre-determined that it should, in common phrase, be damned, is it likely he would bestow upon it such spiritual faculties and tendencies, and surround it with such heavenly influences as would surely work out its salvation? Suppose, on

the other hand, that this soul was one of the number "predestinated unto everlasting life," can we for a moment believe that he, who created it, and in creating had the choice of what it should and what it should not be, would endow it with any powers or agencies which he knew certainly would forever prevent it from attaining to this everlasting life? Or, in briefer phrase, if God intended this soul for hell, would he send a Saviour into the world to bring it to heaven? And if he intended it for heaven, would he send a devil into the world to drag it down to hell?

This places the subject in its true position; and the old Calvinistic ground set out in the above quotation, is the only ground on which the doctrine of endless woe can make any show of defence. If a single soul be damned, it is because it was created for this end, foreseen and foreordained. It was the original thought and plan of God in creating it, and not because he has made a mistake; not because the soul is anything different from what he expected; not because its faculties have been so perverted, to his great grief, that the design of its creation is defeated. This is the only consistent and logical ground for those who assert the omnipotence and omniscience of God.

But for those who also believe in the infinite goodness of God this ground is impossible. It is impossible to believe that "God is Love," as the Apostle declares (1 John iv.), and at the same time believe that he deliberately sat down to the work of giving existence to an immortal soul, only that he might make that existence an endless curse to it! There

can be no more awful blasphemy than this yoking together Infinite and Everlasting Love with Infinite and Everlasting Woe.[1]

But one conclusion, therefore, remains, that God, at the time of creating this soul — and the argument is from one soul to all souls—intended it for everlasting life and blessedness; for an endless growth in knowledge, in spiritual power and heavenly glory. This was his purpose. Hence we have such testimonies as these: "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Rev. iv. 11. "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, *according to his good pleasure* which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him." Eph. i. Here we have a plain and emphatic declaration of the purpose and pleasure of God in regard to the creation and final destiny of all intelligences, whether in heaven or on earth. We see what he created them for. There is no doubt as to his original intention and design.

And now the argument for his infinite wisdom re-

[1] JOHN FOSTER, distinguished among the English Baptists as a thinker and writer, in his letter to a young clergyman troubled with doubts in regard to endless punishment, says, "I acknowledge myself not convinced of the orthodox doctrine. *Endless* punishment! Hopeless misery through a duration to which the most enormous terms of time will be absolutely *nothing!* I acknowledge my inability (I would say it reverently,) to admit this belief together with a belief in the *Divine Goodness* — the belief that *God is Love*, that his tender mercies are over all his works."— *Sheppard's Life and Correspondence of John Foster. Letter* 226.

turns with irresistible force. Creating with this design, he of course arranged his plan of operations, and ordered his government and laws in reference to it. The nature he bestowed on man, the mental forces, the moral sentiments, the religious element, the bodily appetites, were all harmonized to this central thought and aim. The divine omniscience took in all the possibilities and certainties of his life, determined all the circumstances of his lot, foresaw all the influences, however subtle, and inappreciable by us, which would act on him; and pre-arranged that they should all, directly or indirectly, contribute to the purposed result; and to the development and glory of "the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God, and of his unsearchable judgments." Rom. xi. Or in the truthful lines of Akenside:

> "Beholding in the sacred light
> Of his essential reason all the shapes
> Of swift contingence, all successive ties
> Of action propagated through the sum
> Of possible existence, He at once
> Down the long series of eventful time
> So fixed the dates of being, so disposed
> To every living soul of every kind
> The field of motion and the hour of rest,
> That all conspired *to his supreme design,*
> *To universal good!*"

Let us say all we can here of the "free agency" of man, of the obstinacy and depravity of the human heart, of the rejection of the offers and conditions of salvation; and after all the argument founded upon the Scriptural statement, that, "known unto God are all his works from the beginning to the end," furnishes a simple and final reply to it. God either did, or did not, foresee all these difficulties (*if there*

be any difficulties with God,) when he devised his plan of creation and redemption. If he did not foresee them, then he does not know "all his works from the beginning to the end"—but the Bible affirms that he does: He did, therefore, foresee all these difficulties, and foreseeing, of course, he provided against them, and adjusted his plan with express reference to overcoming them.[1]

We must not forget that both the use and the abuse of the freedom of man, lay within the sweep of God's omniscience at the time of creating him. If he had foreseen that man would so abuse this moral freedom as to defeat his purpose in creating, he would have arranged it differently. And as he did not arrange it differently, we need have no fears of its being a hindrance in the way of the fulfilment of that purpose.

Whatever, therefore, the measure of man's freedom, it was embraced in the original plan of his creation, and is perfectly consistent with the aim and end of that plan, viz.: the highest perfection and blessed-

[1] The following is from Dr. JOHNSON, the great lexicographer (if Bp. Porteus is right,) and while it is directly to the point argued in the text, it will show the opinion of this literary giant in regard to the great restoration. The passages are from sermons published by Dr. TAYLOR, but which were undoubtedly written by Dr. JOHNSON. See Boswell's Life, vol. iii. chap. vi.—"We know that God is infinite in wisdom, in power, and in goodness; that therefore he designs the happiness of *all his creatures*; that he cannot but know the proper means by which this end may be obtained; and that, in the use of these means, as he cannot be mistaken because he is omniscient, so he cannot be defeated because he is almighty." In another of these sermons on Psalm cxlv. 9, he says, "Far and wide as is the vast range of existence, so is the Divine benevolence extended; and both in the previous trial and *final retribution of all his rational and moral productions*, the Lord is good to *all*, and his tender mercies are over *all* his works."

ness of which he is constitutionally capable. To this result the wisdom of God is pledged; and all the foreseen means for its accomplishment lie within the reach, and ready at the fitting time for the use, of that Almighty Power which "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Eph. i. And the next section will illustrate the manner in which the Divine Will conforms the human will to its gracious purposes, without in any respect violating its rights, or restraining its freedom or voluntary action.

SECTION III.

THE POWER OF GOD — OMNIPOTENCE, MORAL AND SPIRITUAL, AS WELL AS PHYSICAL.

§ I. *God almighty in his power over mind as well as matter.*—The Bible abounds in declarations of the illimitable and infinite power of God, passages setting forth his ability to create and to destroy, to govern and control the destinies of nations and individuals, to accomplish all his purposes, and to do his will throughout the physical and spiritual universe. It is important to observe the language of this statement—that God is omnipotent, not only in the natural world, but also in the moral and spiritual world. It is as easy for him to create and govern a soul, as to create and govern a sun or a planet. And it requires no more effort on his part to discipline and save a moral being, according to the laws of his moral nature, than it requires to control the solar systems, according to the material laws impressed upon them at the time of their creation.

This fact is part and parcel of the very idea of God, and essential to the successful government of the world, and the realization of the divine plan and purpose in creating man. And this fact is everywhere recognized in the Scripture testimonies to the almighty power of God.

It is not only the sunshine and the rains, the winds and the lightnings, the sea and the rivers, the earth, and its vitalizing forces, that he employs to work out his purposes and wishes; but the thoughts and the affections, the impulses and the actions, the good and the evil, of intelligent and moral beings.

If any one should say that God had created a material world—the "lost pleiad," for example—and that, having created it, he could not control it, could not keep it in its orbit, nor compel it into obedience to the laws of gravitation; but that, by growth of the forces he had incorporated in it, it had broken from his hold, rushed from its heavenly path, and plunged into the infinite abysses of space, carrying confusion, and wreck, and ruin, into all the surrounding systems and constellations; and that the Creator had exerted all his might and power to restore it again to its ancient orbit, and remedy the evils of its rebellion and desertion, but had utterly failed, and was obliged to abandon the effort, and leave its place among the starry orbs forever vacant—

If any one should make such a statement as this, or teach such a doctrine, would not all Christian people say that it was virtually atheism? a rejection of the perfections of the Divine character; a direct denial of the omnipotence and supreme government of God; an accusation against him of weakness and incapacity?

But suppose this person should affirm precisely the same thing of God's creation and government of the spiritual universe; suppose he should teach that he had created a world of intelligent beings, and established over them a moral government, but that contrary to his plan and expectation, the powers and agencies, the intellectual and spiritual forces, which he had bestowed upon them, had developed into an opposition to his authority and rule, which he could not overcome; and that, after exhausting all his moral resources, he was utterly unable to restore man to obedience, and would therefore be obliged to abandon him to endless rebellion and sin, and acknowledge his creation and government, as originally constituted, a complete failure.

Suppose he should affirm this; would there be the slightest difference between it and the former statement regarding the "lost pleiad?" Would it not be substantially the same thing as it respects the atheism, and the denial of the divine omnipotence and perfection? What is the difference, at bottom, whether you deny the power of God over spirit; or deny his power over matter? Whether you say he cannot save a planet, or cannot save a soul, from ruin?

Of course, we do not ignore the essential difference between matter and mind; between the laws which govern a planet, and those which govern a soul. It is not contended that God undertakes to rule and save a free spirit, in the same way in which he holds the sun in its place, or sends a planet through its orbit. But the thing we do contend for, the thing which the complete omnipotence of God logically

necessitates, is, that he is just as ample in his spiritual resources for educating, training, and saving the souls of men, as he is in his physical resources for shaping, guiding, and governing the worlds and constellations in their courses. And we contend, farther, that he can do the first without the violation of any moral agency, or of any spiritual law, just as easy as he can do the last, without the violation of any natural or physical law.

And this, as already said, is clearly and positively the teaching of the Scriptures. "Behold thou hast made the heaven and the earth by thy great power and stretched out arm, and there is nothing too hard for thee."—Jer. xxxii. 17, 27. "O Lord God of our fathers, art not thou God in heaven? and rulest not thou over all the kingdoms of the heathen? and in thine hand is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee."—2 Chron. xx. 6. "He ruleth by his power forever, his eyes behold the nations. The Lord reigneth; he is clothed with majesty; the Lord is clothed with strength, wherewith he hath girded himself: the world also is established that it cannot be moved." — Ps. lxvi. xciii. "Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in heaven, and in earth, and in the seas, and in all deep places."—Ps. cxxxv.

These passages, out of a multitude, set forth the physical omnipotence of the Deity, or his infinite power over the material universe.

But side by side with these are such testimonies as the following, relating to the moral world:—"The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water: *he turneth it whithersoever he will.*"—

Prov. xxi. 1. "A man's heart deviseth his way; but *the Lord directeth his steps*," xvi. 9. "For it is God which *worketh in you both to will and to do* of his good pleasure."—Phil. ii. 13. "For whom he did foreknow *he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image* of his Son, ... moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also *called*."—Rom. viii. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same *God which worketh all in all*."—1 Cor. xii. "Therefore said I unto you that *no man can come unto me, except it were given him of my Father*."—John vi. 65. "Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth."—Rom. ix. 17. "*A new heart will I also give you*, and a new spirit will I put within you; and *I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh*, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and *cause you to walk in my statutes*."—Ezek. xxxvi. 26. "He doeth *according to his will* in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?"—Dan. iv. 35. "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? And Jesus looking upon them, saith, With men it is impossible, but not with God; *for with God all things are possible*."—Mark x. 23—27.

Similar passages might be multiplied to any ex-

tent; but these are sufficient to establish the statement, that the Bible teaches the omnipotence of God in the moral and spiritual world, as well as in the material world: that he governs the affections and purposes of men as easily, and as truly, as he governs the motions of the planets. In his own time, he *takes away* the stony heart of Israel, and *gives* them a new heart and a new spirit, and *causes* them to walk in his statutes. He *predestinates* and *calls* those chosen to the work of the Gospel, and *conforms* them to the image of his Son. He *works in men* both to *will* and to *do* according to his pleasure. He doeth his will equally among the spirits of heaven, and among the inhabitants of earth; and in the work of salvation, there is no degree of selfishness, no love of the world, no darkness of mind, no depravity of heart, too great to be overcome by the infinite power of his truth and love; for the Saviour directly and positively affirms, in regard to this very point, that nothing is impossible with God!

This position established, the next question is, *Since he has the power, will he use it?* Is there any Scriptural evidence that he will put away all sin and evil, renew all hearts, and by the infinite energies of his Spirit, bring all souls into harmony with truth and holiness? The passages which follow, will answer this question:

"I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation; he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness. . . . . For *as* the earth bringeth forth the bud, and *as* the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth, *so*

the Lord God WILL CAUSE righteousness and praise to spring forth before *all the nations*."—Isa. lxi. 10, 11. The comparison here is equally intelligible and positive. As surely as the earth puts forth its bud, and the garden causes the seed sown in it to spring up, so surely will the truth and grace of God put forth their bud also, and in due time cause righteousness to spring up in the hearts of all the nations of the earth. The productive relations of seed and soil are not more fixed in the order of nature, than the results of the regenerating power of divine truth in the soul of man.

And how can it be otherwise? Look at it. If the atmosphere, the sunshine, the rain, electricity, fire, the ocean, the tree, the grain of wheat, every element of nature, answers the purpose in the material world for which it was created; why should the Holy Spirit, why should the Infinite Love of God, be eternally defeated of their ends in the spiritual world?

But this thought is repeated in other words, and the point of the comparison made more significant, if possible. "For AS the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; SO *shall my word be* that goeth forth out of my mouth, it shall not return unto me void, but *it shall accomplish* that which I please, and *it shall prosper* in the thing whereto I sent it."—Isa. lv. 10, 11.

Can anything be more direct and conclusive than this proclamation of the efficiency of the divine will

and spirit in the salvation of mankind? Was it ever known that the rain came down from heaven and went back again without watering the earth? Was it ever known that God failed to restore the earth in spring time, and make it bud and bring forth? Never! Just as surely, then, as the rain does *not* return to the heavens without doing the work for which it was sent, so surely the word of God shall *not* return to him void. As certainly as the forces of nature in spring renew and freshen the earth into life and beauty, and abundance, so certainly shall his truth, the gospel of his grace, renovate and restore the moral world to its primeval beauty and purity. And this is the argument and witness of God himself, to show that, having infinite spiritual power, he *will* use it for the salvation of mankind, as efficiently as he uses his infinite physical power in the creation and renewal of the earth.

But there are other texts going *directly*, without comparison, to the same result. "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; *I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts*: and I will be to them a God, and they *shall be* to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord—for all *shall know me*, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."—Heb. viii. 10—12. Observe, here, not only the universality of the phraseology, but the absoluteness of it. God says, I *will* put my law in their hearts—they *shall* be my people, and they *shall*

know, and their sins and iniquities *shall* be put away. He not only has the moral power to change and save them, but he declares he will employ it to this end.

"There is no God beside me; a just God and a Saviour. Look unto me, and *be ye saved*, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return. That unto me *every knee* shall bow, and *every tongue* shall swear, surely shall say, *In the Lord* have I righteousness and strength—to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed."—Isa. xlv. 21—25. Here we have the same direct and unqualified language from the Lord himself, affirming the truth, that the infinite energies of his spirit *will be used* in renewing the soul of man unto righteousness. There are no conditions nor contingencies here—"BE ye saved"—"every knee *shall* bow"—absolute and certain, wrought out by the will of God, whose omnipotence cannot fail of its end.

§ II. *The Freedom of the human will, or "Free Agency."*—It may be said in reply to the preceding reasoning, that this is simply compelling men to be saved, without regard to their voluntary action. We answer, No; for all this is done in harmony with spiritual laws and man's freedom. There is no compulsion, no force. The comparison of the garden and the rain is still in place. The earth is not compelled mechanically to bud and bring forth, and there is no violation of atmospheric laws when the rain falls. The seed do not lose their freedom or indi-

viduality as seed, because the air, and rain, and sunshine, operating through the soil, develope the germ within, and push it out into leaf, and bud, and blossom, and fruit. So with the soul of man; there is no violation of law, no loss of freedom, no conflict of forces, when the Spirit of God, acting with the truth, sends in the light upon the darkened mind, quickens the affections, and lifts the whole being into the eternal life of faith and love. Paul was as free when he preached the Gospel, as when he persecuted the disciples; and he followed the impulses of his heart as truly, when he asked, submissively, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" as when he left the Damascus gate, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter!" The only difference was that, in the meantime, God had changed his heart; or, in other words, the truth and light of heaven had streamed in upon his soul, and he willingly and rejoicingly followed their lead.

And this is the case with every converted soul. As Dr. Woods, of Andover Seminary, says: "The true convert wills or chooses as really as before. The difference is, he now chooses *right*. He now has a will *truly free*. Before his will was free from compulsion—free in every sense necessary to his being a moral, accountable agent. But after all he was a slave to sin, and under the bondage of corruption. Now he is free, and his will is free in the best sense, free from the slavery of depraved passions and desires. The work of God in conversion *emancipates* the sinner from this degrading bondage, and brings him into subjection to the will of God. This is true liberty, "The glorious liberty of the sons of God." [1]

[1] Woods' Works. vol. v., p. 549. See also his "Letters to Unitarians," Letter x., and "Reply to Ware," Works, vol. iv. 81-90, 250

And the philosophy of this method of conversion and salvation which Paul had experimentally known in his own soul, he afterwards asserted and illustrated in his letter to the Hebrew believers: "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant *make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ.*" Chap. xiii.

In our anxiety to assert the freedom of man's will, we must not forget that God is free as well as man; free to choose, free to work. It is said that, if God influences man so as to make the result certain, then he is not free, he cannot do as he pleases. But if man can so abuse his freedom as to defeat the purpose of God, then God is not free; *he* cannot do as he pleases!

Suppose Paul had possessed a "free agency" which would not yield to the enlightening influences of the Holy Spirit—suppose in the exercise of his freedom, he had chosen to remain Saul, the persecutor, instead of becoming Paul, the apostle, according to the purpose of God; whose freedom would have been greatest in this case? whose will the strongest? whose plans overturned? But is not the principle involved in this case the same operating in the case of every soul finally wrecked and ruined? If God created man for endless happiness and glory, and man abuses his agency to his endless destruction —if God is *not* free to bring him to heaven, and man *is* free to go to hell; whose freedom is mightiest in

this case? whose will prevails? and whose plans are overthrown? [1]

We should be careful, as observed, in defending human freedom, not to destroy Divine freedom. And we must remember that if man is a "free agent," and can do as *he* chooses; God is also a "free agent," and can do as *he* chooses—and that if the will and purpose of man come into conflict with the will and the purpose of God, there can be but one issue to such a conflict. God will prevail: and, as remarked he will prevail so as in no way to violate any law of our spiritual constitution, or infringe in the slightest degree the moral liberty with which he has endowed us.

Look at the following record: "And Jesus, walk-

[1] Dr. Woods has a good thing on this point, which deserves a place here: "No one can have any power except what God gives, and there can be no greater absurdity than to suppose that God will give to any of his creatures a power which he cannot control, and which shall in any possible circumstances, so come in the way of his administration as actually to prevent him from doing what he wills to do. If he is really omnipotent, and if all power in creation depends on him, it must be that he will do all his pleasure; that whatever he sees on the whole to be the best he will certainly accomplish.

"As the supreme government of God relates to all his works, it relates particularly to the *moral* world. This is the most important part of the creation, and it is of course most of all important that this should be managed right; and to be managed right, is to be managed according to the will of God: or in other words according to the dictates of infinite perfection. If God is prevented from doing his own righteous and holy will, he is prevented by something *within* himself, or something *without* himself. If by something *within* himself, then there are contradictory attributes in his own spiritual nature: an imperfection in a mind which is absolutely perfect; a principle opposed to wisdom and goodness in one who is infinitely wise and good. And to suppose that he is in any case hindered from doing his own pleasure by any thing *without* himself, that is, by something in created beings, is to suppose that he has designedly invested them with power to frustrate his designs. And this is the same as to suppose that he purposely acts against himself"—*Biblical Repository, Jan.*, 1844.

ing by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea; for they were fishers. And he said unto them, *Follow me*, and I will make you fishers of men. *And they straightway left their nets, and followed him.* And going on from thence, he saw two brethren, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in a ship with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and *he called them.* And they *immediately left the ship and their father, and followed him.*" Matt. iv. 18–22. And after these things he went forth, and saw a publican, named Levi, sitting at the Receipt of Custom, and he said unto him, *Follow me.* And he *left all, rose up and followed him.*" Luke v. 27.

Now were these men *compelled* to leave all and follow Jesus, in any sense that implied unwillingness on their part? Was their "free agency" violated, or did they follow their own wishes and preferences? Of course the last. They were just as free, acted just as entirely out of their own hearts, when they became the disciples of Jesus, as when they followed their former occupations. God had a new and higher work for them; and when the time came, and the work was ready for them, they were ready for the work. And Peter and Andrew and James and John went into the ministry of the Gospel, as cheerfully as they ever went out upon the Lake of Galilee to fish. And Matthew, the tax-gatherer, even celebrates his abandonment of the custom-house, and his conversion and obedience to the call of Christ, by a joyful gathering of his former business associates and friends. Luke v. 29.

There is no form which opposition to the great truth of universal reconciliation takes, indicative of such entire ignorance of the nature of man, of the philosophy of the human affections, as that which so persistently sets up against it, the doctrine of "free agency," and argues from it that "God will not *compel* men to be saved, will not *force* them into heaven."

Do we *compel* the drunkard into temperance, when by showing him the evil of his course, and the benefits and blessings of a temperate life, and helping him to conquer his raging appetite, we restore him to himself and his family a reformed and happy man? And when the abandoned outcast, the depraved and hardened criminal, is subdued into tears and penitence by the earnest prayers and exhortations, by the persevering labor of love in his behalf; and finally shakes off the palsy of his sin, and enters gladly upon a new life of virtue and holiness — when thus he faces about towards heaven, is he *forced* to it in any sense that does not make the force a joy and a triumph to him? in any sense that does not leave him, heart and soul, free as the air he breathes? Did ever a reformed sinner complain that he was driven into reformation against his will?

And when through their much patience and gentleness, and long-suffering affection, a disobedient and wilful child is brought to the feet of his parents in shame and repentance, is any violence done to his freedom as a moral being? Is it not rather that, instructed by their teachings, and overcome by their love, he chooses what they choose for him, and so his will and theirs come into concurrence and unity.

Was the Prodigal Son any less free in wish or feeling, in purpose or will, when, taught by his folly, and influenced by his circumstances, and *compelled*, if you will, by his sufferings, he said "I will arise, and go to my Father," than when he "gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance in riotous living?" Not one iota less free; but infinitely wiser by his sorrowful experience, and willing henceforth to be guided by his father, and to find rest, and peace in the dear old home which gave him such loving welcome back.

And I am happy to add here a testimony and an illustration on the point involved, from John Wesley, the founder of Methodism. "There seems," says he, "to be a plain and simple way of removing this difficulty, without entangling ourselves in any subtle, metaphysical disquisition. As God is one, so the work of God is uniform in all ages. May we not then conceive how he *will* work on the souls of men in time to come, by considering how he does work now? and how he has wrought in times past? Take one instance of this in which you cannot be deceived. You know how God wrought in your own soul. He did not take away your understanding, but enlightened and strengthened it. He did not destroy any of your affections; rather they were more vigorous than before. Least of all did he take away your liberty, your power of choosing good and evil; he did not *force* you; but being assisted by his grace, you, like Mary, *chose* the better part. Just as he has assisted thousands, without depriving any of them of that liberty which is essential to a moral agent. Now in the same manner as God *has* converted so many to him-

self, without destroying their liberty, he can undoubtedly, convert whole nations, *or the whole world!* It is as easy for him to convert a world, as one individual soul." [1]

And it is curious to see how the Arminian and the Calvinist both unite on this point to sustain the preceding reasoning. The following is from Prof. Stuart, late of the Andover Institution:

"Men who doubt and reason thus do in their own hearts, make the work of conversion a mere business of moral suasion by force of reasoning and argument. They overlook the *omnipotence of that Spirit, whose office it is to bow the stubborn will, and soften the hearts of the unbelieving.* What! are not all things possible with God? Can he not 'make the people willing in the day of his power?' Cannot he, who works in men 'according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead,' can he not make the deaf to hear, and the blind to see? Can he not raise the dead to life? Has he not *promised* to do all this? Has he not often repeated the assurance that he will do it? Has he not done it in numberless instances? Is any thing too hard for God? Are not 'all hearts in his hand;' and so in it, that he can turn them whithersoever he will, even as the rivers of water are turned? *Can any resist God's will?* Cannot he whose mighty power bowed the hearts of our pagan ancestors — cannot he bow the hearts of the children of Abraham? With the apostle I answer, 'The Jews also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be

[1] Sermon on Isaiah, xi. 9

grafted in; for God is able to graft them in.' Rom. 11: 23. *And how can they abide in unbelief*, when, according to the promise of God, of which he will never repent, the seed of Abraham shall have a new heart, and a right spirit given to them? The supposition calls in question the veracity of God! To doubt on this subject, is to question his power and his truth, the reality of the Christian religion, and the *omnipotence* of the *Holy Spirit!* Believers in the Scriptures are not permitted to doubt. The thing is *certain.* The decree has gone forth, stamped with Heaven's own seal upon it. Jehovah hath sworn by himself, that *every knee shall yet bow to Jesus, and every tongue confess that he is Lord.*"

"The day and the hour, when all which has been promised may be fulfilled, we may not know. It is not essential that we should know them. But the *promises of God*, the *facts* which he has declared shall take place, *are certain.*" [1]

[1] *Sermon at Ordination of* W. G. SCHAUFFLER. The following, from Dr. POND, of the Bangor Theological Seminary, is conclusive on the point:

"The question therefore comes to this, *Is it* IMPOSSIBLE *for God to convert and save all men?*

But in what sense can this be considered as impossible? Is it inconsistent with the nature of the human mind, and with the freedom and accountability of man? Such a supposition is *a priori* incredible; because God made the minds of men, as well as their bodies — made them free, accountable agents—and it is not likely that he would give existence to a being which it was impossible for him to control. Besides, is it not a fact that God *does control* the minds of men, of all men, in perfect consistency with their freedom and accountability? I speak not now of the manner in which this is done, whether by a direct efficiency in view of motives, or by the mere influence of motives;—the fact that it *is done* will not be denied, except by those who deny that God executes his purposes and governs the world. The *Scriptures* too — by

The result, then, of our Scriptural investigations respecting the omnipotence of God is substantially this: That his power over spirit is as absolute as is his power over matter—that he *can* do his will as easily, and that he *will* do it as certainly, in the moral world as in the material world — that he not only has the power to lead his children from darknes into light, from unbelief and sin into faith and righteousness, to take away their evil heart and give them a new heart and a new spirit, and finally to reconcile and restore all things to himself; but that "in the dispensation of the fulness of times," he *will* do it, teaching through Christ, sanctifying through his Holy Spirit, and so establishing the reign of Love and Holiness throughout the universe forever more!

SECTION IV.

THE GOODNESS OF GOD — INFINITE AND UNCHANGEABLE.

It would be a work of supererogation to enter upon an elaborate argument to prove that God is infinitely good. Goodness is his nature and essence— "*God is Love*," 1 John iv. And the very word "good" is but another way of saying "God;" for

necessary implication, by direct assertion, and in almost every form of representation and expression—exhibit the free minds of men as subject to the control of Him who ruleth all.

God's control over the free, responsible mind is also exhibited in every instance of conversion. Every conversion which takes place is the work of God's Spirit, accomplished in perfect consistency with the nature of the mind, and without any infringement of human freedom or accountability. But are not all minds constituted essentially alike? And if it is possible for God to convert one sinner in the manner above described, why not two? why not as many as he pleases? why not *all*?"

in the old Saxon, God and Good are one word, and not two, as with us. The word meant "goodness" or "the good," and hence, because of the infinitely benevolent character and disposition of the Divine Being, it was used to designate him, both as a name and a title.[1]

The evidences and manifestations of God's goodness, are co-extensive with his creation; and its universality and eternity are affirmed everywhere in the Sacred Scriptures. The heavens, the earth, and the sea, are his witnesses; and prophets and apostles, Moses and Jesus, bear the same testimony to the truth, that "the Lord is good unto all, and his tender mercies over all his works." Ps. 145:9.

If, then, the very essence of the Deity is Love, if he is infinitely, and, of course, unchangeably good, all his actions must be good, everything he does, or ever will do, must proceed from his eternal love. The creation of man, the government of the world, his providence, his laws, his penalties and punishments, the mingled joys and sorrows, the good and evil of our lot, all originate in beneficent wisdom, and must have a beneficent end.

Of course, we cannot judge safely of the means, but we are sure of the end. God says, truly:—"My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are my ways your ways. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."—Isa. lv. Often

[1] It is worthy of note that, while God is so frequently called Love, he is never said to be Wisdom, or Power, or Justice. These are only attributes, or manifestations of the Deity; but Love is his essence, the very nature and substance of God.

he accomplishes his designs in ways far above ours, and which we cannot understand; but, whatever the ways and means employed, when the end is reached, it will be found to be full of blessing. This is the necessary consequence of the fact of infinite goodness. No other conclusion is possible.

By the help of this plain and indisputable truth, let the reader interpret the language already cited in part, in a previous section:—"By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained unto everlasting death. Those of mankind, that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting life, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions and causes moving him thereunto."[1]

[1] And that I may not seem to make the present responsible for the past, I give the following, copied *verbatim*, from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, as ratified by the General Assembly, in May, 1821, and amended in 1833, and published under the sanction of the Assembly in 1834. The Presbyterians in the United States, number more than 4500 Ministers.

"God, from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own *will*, freely and unchangeably *ordain* whatsoever comes to pass.

* * * * * * * *

By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his *glory*, some men and angels are *predestinated* unto everlasting life, and others *foreordained* to everlasting death.

These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained, are *particularly and unchangeably designed*, and their number is so *certain* and *definite*, that it cannot be either *increased* or *diminished*.

Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the

Now, it is a matter of little consequence, so far as it concerns the character of God, whether this awful result was foreordained by immutable decree, or simply foreseen by an all-comprehending knowledge, (and this is a point which those who reject the decrees with horror, and yet hold to endless punishment, do not seem to understand,) for the principle, the moral element involved, is the same in both cases. There can be no foreordination without a foreknowledge and choice of what is to be foreordained; and, on the other hand, there can be no certain foreknowledge of what is to come to pass, with-

foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without *any foresight of faith* or *good works*, or perseverance in either of them, or any *other thing* in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto, and all to the praise of his glorious grace.

As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, *foreordained all the means thereunto*. Wherefore, they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ, by his Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power, through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified and saved, but the elect only.

The *rest of mankind*, God was *pleased*, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, *to pass by* and to *ordain* them to *dishonor* and *wrath* for their sin, to the *praise* of his *glorious justice*.

The doctrine of this *high mystery of predestination* is to be handled with *special prudence* and *care*, that men attending the will of God revealed in his word, and yielding obedience thereunto, may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation, be assured of their eternal election. So shall this doctrine afford matter of *praise*, *reverence* and *admiration* of God, and of *humility*, *diligence*, and *abundant consolation*, to all that truly obey the gospel." Compare this with the Andover Confession.

out a prior foreordination of what shall come to pass. So far, therefore, as it affects the quality of goodness, it is the same whether God, in creating, foreordained everlasting death as the result; or foreknew that, if he created, this would certainly be the result.

Now, is it possible to believe, in the goodness or justice of a Being who, in the act of creation, without regard to moral character or conduct, says to himself:—"These I create and foreordain to a life of endless blessedness; and these I create and foreordain to a life of endless torment! And no good that these can do will save them from the curse; and no evil that those can do will hinder their joy. It is not from any foresight of faith or unbelief, of good works or evil works, or any other thing in them moving me thereunto, that I foreordain these different conditions or destinies, but solely out of the secret counsel and good pleasure of my will, and as a manifestion of my glory and free grace!"

To say nothing of the justice of such a monstrous proceeding, it is not in the power of any sane mind, or sound heart, to pronounce such a Being infinitely good. To say that God has acted in this way, and at the same time to say that he is good, is to confound all distinctions between good and evil, and to make the proof of benevolence and mercy to rest on the same acts which are the strongest proof of cruelty and fiendishness.

No more thorough refutation of such a theology can be devised, than the simple statement that God is infinitely good. That is a sufficient reply, not only to the asserted foreordination, but to the possibility of everlasting death.

The only end which an infinitely good Being could propose to himself, as the motive for creating, would be simply the multiplication of intelligent creatures, in his own likeness, to become partakers of the happiness which finds its fulness in him. He would enter on the work of creation only that he might have more immortal beings on whom to pour out his infinite love, and with whom, finally made equal unto the angels, he might people the heavenly mansions — the realms of light and joy.

It is easy to see how the God of the New Testament, the God whom the blessed Saviour addresses as "Our Father, who art in Heaven," should entertain such a purpose as this; and, therefore, create for himself immortal spirits, children of his own, on whom to lavish the wealth of his infinite love; finally gathering them around the throne of his glory that he might rejoice in them, and they in him, world without end. Such purpose and action as this, is precisely what we should look for in such a divinely beneficent being. It would be consistent with the character of a God who, by way of emphasis, is repeatedly described and named in the Gospel Scriptures by the single word "*Love.*"

And it is pleasing to turn back to the Universalists of sixteen and seventeen hundred years ago, and find their reasoning on this point in perfect accord with our own. Clement, of Alexandria, nearly contemporary with the apostle John, (A. D., 190,) says: —"The Lord is good unto all, and delights in all. Man is, indeed, necessarily dear to God, because he is his own workmanship. Other things he made only by his order, but man he formed by his own

hand, and breathed into him his distinguishing properties. Now, whatever was created by him, especially in his own image, must have been created because it was, in itself, desirable to God, or else desirable from some other consideration. There could be no other reason why God should create him, than that God could not otherwise be a benevolent Maker, nor his glory be displayed to the human race. There is nothing that the Lord hates, for he cannot hate any thing, and yet will that it should exist; nor can he will that any thing should not exist, and at the same time cause it to exist. And if he hates none of his works, then it is evident that he loves them all, especially man above the rest, who is the most excellent of his creatures; a being desirable to God, since he who cannot err, made him just such as he desired him to be. Now, whoever loves another, wishes to benefit him, and, therefore, God does good unto all; not blessing them in some particulars, and neglecting them in others, but carefully solicitous for all their interests." [1]

But, turning from this a moment, let us approach the subject from another side. There are only three positions conceivable, as the purpose and end of creating mankind, whatever the character or disposition of the Creator.

1. The final misery of all.

2. The final misery of a part, and the final happiness of the rest.

3. The final happiness of all.

[1] *Pædagog. Lib. i.* cap. 3 & 8. *Ancient History of Universalism*. chap. iii. As I shall frequently quote from the ancient fathers of our faith, I may as well say here, that the quotations are always from Dr Ballou's History, except when other authority is given.

One of these must have been the motive for creating, the end which God proposed to himself in entering upon the work. The *first* would make him infinitely malignant; the *second* would make him a compound of good and evil, capricious, partial, unjust, and cruel; and the *third only* makes him infinitely benevolent, and, as the Bible declares, "good unto all," and his wisdom "full of mercy and good fruits, and without partiality."

It is idle to argue that God is infinitely good, and at the same time affirm that he would create an immortal being, knowing at the moment of doing it, that the existence he was forcing upon him, would prove an endless curse to him. To call him good, in such case, is to use words without sense. Goodness is not a name, a mere title, but character, principle, conduct. As Dr. Channing truly says: "It is very possible to speak of God magnificently, and to think of him meanly; to apply to his person high sounding epithets, and to his government principles which make him odious." If God deliberately went to the work of creating millions of intelligent beings, with the certain knowledge — we will not say intention, or purpose — but with the certain knowledge that they would in any way, through any agency or sin of their own, fall into a condition of endless wickedness and torment; then he is not infinitely good, not good to them at all, in any just sense of the word.

And it is of no avail here to put in the argument of present sin and evil, and say, "If infinite goodness will not permit endless evil and suffering, so by the same rule we should argue that it would not permit present sin and evil. It does permit temporary evil;

therefore it may permit endless evil." There is an infinite difference in the two cases. Sin and suffering for a time, as a means, admit of explanation; but sin and suffering as final and endless, for their own sake, admit of no explanation.[1]

It would be just as reasonable to contend that, because it is consistent with the architect's plan to have a scaffolding around the building while in process of erection, it will be equally so to keep it there when the building is finished — or that if it be necessary to permit the rubbish to lie around while the work is going on, it will be necessary to leave it there when the work is completed. Many things may be permitted as a means, which could not be sanctioned as an end. Many books and charts may be necessary while pursuing an education, which may be thrown aside when our education is complete.

Besides, this argument proves too much, and involves consequences which those who use it cannot accept. The argument is thus: God's goodness permits suffering in this world, therefore it may permit it in the next — it does not save sinners from present temporary misery, therefore it will not save them from future endless misery. The same Love which would forbid the one, would forbid the other.

Suppose we take up this argument and extend it as

[1] "We hold that though God permits evil, the evil is not regnant, but a surely defeated enemy. We hold that the actual working powers of God for good, are regnant to overcome all evil in every soul, and presently and surely tending toward the destruction of all evil. We hold that the very sty of sin and husks of lowest misery are overruled to send the prodigal back to God. The ideal personation of evil, Satan or Devil, is forced to speak effectively for God, and so *God reigns to redeem every soul.*" *Christian Examiner*, March, 1861.

follows: God permits the righteous to be afflicted and to suffer in this world; therefore he will permit them to be afflicted and to suffer in the next world. The same Love, the same Justice, which would forbid the one, would forbid the other. If his benevolence would lead him to deliver them hereafter, the same benevolence would lead him to deliver them here — he does not deliver them here; therefore he will not deliver them hereafter; and their misery must be endless.

But again: All who are not saved now, never will be saved; for if infinite goodness can consistently leave them unsaved to day, it can with equal consistency leave them unsaved to-morrow, and next day, and forever. You cannot argue from the Love of God for the conversion and salvation of a single soul now unconverted, because the same Love would necessitate its conversion and salvation now, this very moment!

The absurdity of such reasoning is apparent without an elaborate exposure of its illogical and unphilosophical character. God of course has established the world, created man, and determined his present and future condition, according to a fixed plan, embracing not only a clearly defined end, but all the means necessary to that end. He does not do everything at once. He does not design to save all at once by a miracle; but gradually by appointed agencies, and according to the laws of their spiritual nature. Each day has its specific work, each event its special meaning; and these stand related not only to the present, but to the future; links in the great chain of being, whose end is fastened at the throne of God. We can only judge of the unfinished parts, when we come to see the finished whole. And that the finished whole

embraces the good of all created intelligences, is, as we have shown, a necessary and unavoidable deduction from the acknowledged fact, that he who created is himself INFINITE GOODNESS!

Neither can any argument against this grand consummation of universal beatitude, be set up on the ground of man's unbelief and sin; "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." Rom. xi. In his impartial goodness he counts all in unbelief, only that he may have mercy on all. Hence also it is written, that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. v. However far, therefore, sin and its consequences may abound, Divine Grace and Goodness are to abound over and beyond all, through "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." John i. 29. The sin of man is not too great for the goodness of God to overcome. Its nature is to endure, and forgive, and weary out the heart of sin and wickedness by its patient, long-suffering, infinite tenderness. And so it becomes example, precept, and exhortation to us, that we may be "followers of God as dear children." Eph. iv. 32; v. 1.

And this brings us to another important point in the discussion, worthy of profound thought and study. If the goodness of God be not of the nature and power here set forth, if it do not embrace the conversion, purification, and final welfare of his sinful and rebellious children, how are we to interpret such teachings as the following: "I say unto you, love

your enemies, do good to them which hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you. . . . . For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same. . . . But love your enemies, and do good, and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest; for he is kind to the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." Luke vi.

Is it possible to believe that God expects greater goodness and mercy in us than he himself possesses? Would he command us, poor, frail, tempted mortals, to love our enemies, when he has not the moral courage to do it himself? Can any Christian suppose for a moment that God would command us to bless and do good to those who hate us, when he means eternally to curse and do evil to those who hate him? Why should he expect us to be so much more generous, and merciful and sublime, than he is himself? And if we say that he loves only those who love him — if we say he will hate his enemies, and curse those who curse him, do we not put him on a level with sinners, "who also do even the same?"

But why ask these questions? God is, and does, all and infinitely more than he asks us to be or to do. The very language of the passage cited shows this. By loving our enemies and doing good to those who hate us, we are said to become children of the Highest, to be like God; we are said to be merciful *as* our Father in heaven is merciful. He furnishes us

the example in his goodness and forgiveness towards us, and calls upon us to follow it in our feeling and conduct towards each other. So, therefore, if in loving our enemies, and blessing those who curse us, we are like God, he will do the same; and his infinite and everlasting goodness will reveal its power in subduing all enmity, in purifying all hearts from sin, and restoring the whole family of man to holiness and happiness.

SECTION V.

THE JUSTICE OF GOD — WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT DEMANDS.

No attribute of the Divine character has led to so much vague thinking and reasoning as that of Justice. And perhaps in its human definitions and applications, it would be difficult to find a word more generally misunderstood and misapplied. Lexicographers give to it meanings, judicial authorities state its duties and demands, and theologians assign to it principles and aims, than which nothing could be farther from its nature and office. Retribution, in the sense of retaliation, of so much pain for so much wrong, vindictive punishment, evil for evil, are elements entering largely into the popular, the judicial, and the theological thought on this subject.[1]

[1] The English Imperial Dictionary, Webster, and others, give as one definition of Justice, "vindictive retribution;" and define "vindictive" to be "*revengeful, given to revenge.*" Bellamy takes up the point with a manifest relish: "Vindictive justice is a glorious and amiable perfection of the Deity. The ejection of the sinning angels out of heaven down to eternal darkness and despair, turning our first parents out of paradise, and dooming them and all their race to death, and the final sentence to be passed on apostate angels and apostate men, at the day of judgement, *are all perfect in beauty.* The divine char-

The leading Church treatises on the death of Christ, and on the character and purpose of the atonement, are based on these views of the nature of Justice as one of the perfections of the Deity. And all the forces of argument and of learning, all the aids of tradition and heathen mythology, are to day summoned to the work of proving that Christ died upon the cross to satisfy the demands of Divine Justice, and release man from the punishment of his sins. It is affirmed that he suffered the wrath of God, as the substitute of mankind; endured in his own person the curse of the law, which is defined to be endless punishment for each and every sin committed from the foundation of the world.

The latest and most approved defence of Church doctrines against the attacks of Rationalism, so called, presents the matter in this form: "God the Father laid upon his Son the weight of the sins of the whole world, so that he bare in his own body the wrath which men must else have borne, because there was

acter, as exhibited to view in these facts, is altogether glorious; for it is a glorious thing in God thus to punish sin according to its desert. Therefore,

It can be owing to nothing but criminal blindness, to the spirit of a rebel, of an enemy, in any of God's subjects, that the glory of his character, as thus exhibited, does not shine into their hearts. .... And, therefore, no sooner is a sinner renewed by the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit, but he begins to see the beauty of vindictive justice. *The law, as a ministration of death*, now begins to appear glorious; for now he begins to see things as they be. For now his eyes are opened. .... And vindictive justice being a glorious and amiable perfection, it was a glorious and amiable thing in God to bruise Christ, and put his soul to grief, who had espoused our cause, and appeared as our representative."—*Essay on the Nature and Glory of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, &c.* By Joseph Bellamy, D, D., pp. 127 - 130. Edit. 1795.

no other way of escape for them; and thus the Atonement was a manifestation of Divine Justice." "Jesus did suffer all these things which are the evident tokens of wrath against us .... and when all the vials of wrath were poured out upon his head, and when he did not shrink from receiving them, it is idle to discuss whether this shall be called wrath or love; when he smarted under all that we call punishment, it is idle to say that it must have another name." "He who alone was no child of wrath, meets the shock of the thunderstorm of Divine wrath, becomes a curse for us, and a vessel of wrath." "The clouds of God's anger gathered thick over the whole human race; they discharged themselves on Jesus only.[1]

If these representations of Divine Justice be correct and Scriptural, they cannot fail to suggest to the thoughtful student and inquirer such questions as follow:

1. Can justice be satisfied without its demands are answered? with what it does not require nor wish? The theology in review says it will — says it will not only be satisfied with what it does not demand, but with the very opposite of this. It demands the punishment of the guilty, but will be satisfied with the punishment of the innocent. It demands the endless suffering of all men for their sins, but will be satisfied with the infinite suffering of Christ, who never sinned. Nay, God proposes this arrangement, prefers it, in order that the guilty may escape!

[1] Aids to Faith, Essay viii., on "The Death of Christ." The whole animus of the essay is to prove the vicarious character of Christ's death, that he suffered to satisfy Divine Justice, and release the guilty world from the punishment due its sins.

This arrangement completed, it is said, that those believing in Christ will be saved; those not believing will be damned. *How do we know this?* Justice has once been satisfied without its claims being met, why not again? If it has once punished the innocent, and cleared the guilty, why not a second time? Why not always? If the divine government be administered on this principle, for aught that can be shown to the contrary, unbelievers may yet go to heaven, and believers to hell.

2. If Christ really and truly suffered the punishment due the world, by what law, by what interpretation of justice, is the punishment inflicted a second time? It is not to the point to say, that the penalty of the law was endured by Christ on condition that the guilty should accept the terms of deliverance, before they could avail themselves of the release.

The question is reduced to this simple statement—Christ either did satisfy the claims of justice by his death, or he did not. If he *did*, then justice has no further claim, has nothing to say on the matter of punishment. It has received all it is entitled to, and it has virtually given a quit claim to all mankind.[1] But if he did not satisfy the demands of divine justice, then confessedly his death ends in failure, and the question is still open for settlement.

But in order to reach the stand point from which the whole question of Justice, its nature and demands,

[1] To this point see Article xxxi. of the Episcopal Church; "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world both original and actual," &c.

may be clearly seen and understood, let us begin by inquiring,—

§ I. *What is Justice? What does it demand?* Let us first attempt a definition which, simple and intelligible, and free from all metaphysical niceties, shall yet cover the whole ground of essence and office. The following will perhaps meet the case:

Justice is the principle which seeks always to maintain the Right, and to make right whatsoever is wrong.

At the bottom this is all — everything else rests on this, whether pains, penalties, punishments or restorations. They are only phases of this leading thought, agencies for accomplishing this chief end and aim. Let us then note a few facts here.

1. Justice does not demand pain for the sake of pain. It always looks beyond this, and aims at something else. Pain or punishment is an agent employed with a view to correct what is wrong; to expel the evil, as medicine is used to expel the disease.

2. Justice does not demand a fixed measure of pain for all wrong or sin, which must be suffered by some one, either the guilty or a substitute — indifferent which, so long as it is suffered, so long as so much punishment follows so much sin.[1]

3. Justice does not demand that the sinner must suffer just as much wrong as he has inflicted — be-

[1] "Jesus dies to bear a doom laid on him of necessity, because *some one must* bear it." *Aids to Faith*, p. 378. What should we say of a government which, because a murder had been committed, should put to death an innocent person, on the ground that, as some one had committed a murder, some one must be executed in order to vindicate the majesty of the law!

cause two wrongs do not make one right. If you burn my house, it will not rebuild it to burn yours. The thing justice requires is that my house should be re-built, and I placed where I was before you fired it, compensated by you for all my loss and inconvenience. Burning your house and subjecting you to the same loss and discomfort, will not do the least thing toward it. If I am angry and revengeful toward you, it may gratify my revenge to see you paid in the same coin; but it will not be justice, which demands that all wrong shall be made right, and that your feelings toward me shall be so changed as to secure me from a repetition of the wrong.

The old law, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, was not justice, but revenge. If A destroys an eye of B, it will not restore B's eye to destroy one of A's—it only doubles the loss or injury. B cannot see any better because his enemy sees worse. It is on this ground that Christ repudiates the evil for evil practices of his age, and initiates the beautiful law of good for evil, with a view to the correction of the evil; asserting at the same time that this is the rule of the divine government and action —"that ye may be like your Father in heaven."

Let us now look at Justice in its theological bearings, as connected with the punishment of sin.

All agree that sin is a wrong, a great wrong. This being so, what has justice to do in the case? what are its demands? what will satisfy them? We are told that if the wrong be not righted within a specified time, justice will be satisfied to increase the wrong infinitely, and perpetuate it to all eternity! Can anything be more unjust than such justice?

The divine law requires us to do right — we disobey and do wrong. Here is the sin, and at this point, justice enters and promptly demands reparation — not mere suffering, but reparation — demands that the sin shall cease, that the wrong shall be made right. And how is this to be done? There is only one way of doing it; and that is by saving the sinner from his sins; correcting, restoring the transgressor, and putting an end to his wickedness and the injury he is doing.

If you refuse food to your hungry brother to-day, it will not feed him to keep you hungry to-morrow. But, if by keeping you hungry to-morrow, you are made to suffer something of the knawing pain of starvation, and so repent of the wrong done your poor brother, and feed him next day and ever after when he is in need—then justice sanctions the pain inflicted on you, and rejoices in the removal of your evil heart, and your restoration to obedience to the law of love and duty.

Nothing, therefore, can be more contrary to the very essence of justice, than the doctrine that it requires obedience and righteousness here; but if it cannot have these, it will be satisfied with endless disobedience and sin hereafter as a substitute. Strange justice is this, to compensate the loss of right by an infinitely greater wrong—to undertake to correct the evil of present sin, by adding to it the evil of endless sin and woe conjoined.

Suppose all the great powers of Europe should unite in a protest against slavery in this country, on the ground that it was a great moral wrong, a monstrous wickedness and cruelty against its victims —

and at the close should announce that, unless we speedily abolished the evil, they would free the blacks and reduce the whole white population to slavery. Would this help the matter? Not at all. It would only be increasing the evil ten-fold, instead of correcting or abolishing it.

It may be answered, that it would nevertheless be a just retribution, what they richly deserve; but that would not remove the difficulty. It would not be an abolition of slavery, which is the real injustice, but only a shifting of the curse from one class to another. The simple truth is, that slavery is wrong, and the only thing for justice to do, is to put an end to it altogether; and not to do as much wrong, or a hundred fold more, to the authors of the wrong than they have done to its victims.

So it is exactly with all sin, whatever its character or direction. Justice demands simply that it shall come to an end, and it will be satisfied with nothing but this. There is no substitute possible. It knows well enough that if sin be an evil in this world, it will not help the matter to make it endless in the next world.

The sum of its demands and claims is this, and this only—that all wrong shall give place to right, all sin shall be destroyed, and all evil end in good. For this it labors continually, and will, till the end is reached. Whatever pains, penalties or punishments are needful to this end, it will employ; and, through all, mercy stands at her side with encouraging aid. Neither will abandon the work till it is finished; till sin and death are destroyed, and everlasting life and righteousness brought in.

Justice and Mercy are not opposed. God is not at war with himself. One attribute does not demand what another refuses. *Justice asks for nothing but what is right, and mercy asks for nothing that is wrong.* Revenge may demand suffering for its own sake, but justice demands only righteousness; and is satisfied when all things are re-adjusted in their original position, and universal right prevails.

It may, perhaps, be thought that the above argument does not sufficiently consider the injury which sin inflicts on others — as for example, the crime of murder, where not only life is taken, but incalculable suffering and anguish sent into the hearts of all the survivors.

Ought not the murderer to be punished for all this, and made in justice to suffer something of the misery which his guilt has brought upon the innocent?

Of course he is to be punished — but why? for what purpose? Let us be careful that we do not confound Justice with Revenge. What do we want to accomplish by his punishment? Suppose we hang him — that does not bring his victim to life. Suppose we roast him over a slow fire, or stretch him upon the rack, and tear his nerves, and break his bones one by one, and gradually rend his quivering body into fragments, while the family and relatives of the murdered man stand looking on. Will that restore the dead? will it comfort the living? will they now go home feeling that all is right, that Justice is satisfied — that they themselves are satisfied? If not, what is the thing accomplished by his suffering? what is the thing intended to be accomplished by it?

It may be said, that he ought to suffer as a crim-

inal; that our sense of justice demands that he who inflicts evil on others without cause, should be made to endure in proportion to the injury he inflicts. But is it our sense of justice, or our desire to retaliate, our love of revenge, which says this? Besides, does not Christ set this matter right, in either case; whether it be justice or revenge we seek? "Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Resist not evil," i. e. with evil. Is this *justice* toward the transgressor? It may not be our idea of justice, but it is the justice and the law of Christ—and he is a safer teacher than our anger or our hatred.

But transfer this now to the sphere of divine justice and punishment, and to the future life. Suppose you send this criminal to hell, and subject him to the most awful tortures infinite knowledge and power can devise, and protract them through all eternity. This is the demand of absolute justice, we are told—but what is the thing aimed at now? What is to be gained? what reparation is there here? How does this rectify the wrong that has been done? Does this endless torment restore the murdered man to his family, and repair the injury inflicted on him and on them? Is it a satisfactory equivalent for what they have suffered? Does it make *their* life on earth — does it make *his* life in heaven, any happier, to know that the guilty wretch who did them wrong is in hell? Do Christians on earth — do the sanctified spirits of heaven, demand of the justice of God that those who have injured them, that all sinners, shall suffer the torments of an endless hell?

No human being, however much he may have been

wronged, however fierce his desire for revenge, ever asked for so terrible a thing as this. And if they who have suffered from sin, if the injured wife of a drunken husband, if the unhappy subject of slander or oppression, if the crushed and mangled slave, if the victim of the murderer, and his unhappy family — if these, who have suffered so much from the sin, do not demand endless torment, why should God, who has suffered nothing, demand it, and call it justice?

So far from demanding this, the Bible everywhere declares that God will render a *just* recompense to the transgressor, that he will punish sinners *according* to their sins, will reward every man *according* to his works.[1]

And infinite woe is not according to finite sin. If a sin were to reach in its consequences every inhabitant of earth, yet there would be a limit to the number injured. If it were to blast the happiness of the whole race through every year and moment of their life on earth, still there would be a limit in time as well as in numbers. Count, therefore, the evil of sin as you will, it cannot be added up to the infinite, either in quantity, quality or time; and if not, then infinite endless punishment is not *according* to the transgression — and Justice, therefore, which demands equity and fair dealing, repudiates it, and calls for a punishment proportionate to the wrong.[2]

[1] Matt. xvi. 27. Rom. ii. 6. 2 Tim. iv. 14. Rev. ii. 23, xx. 12, xxii. 12. See also Psalm lxii. 12. Prov. xxiv. 12, 29. Jer. l. 29. Hosea, xii. 2, &c.

[2] Let us suppose a case that we may see how little the doctrine of endless punishment has to do with the *just* recompense of sin. A lives a

But what is this punishment proportionate to the wrong! What do the Scriptures mean by rewarding every one according to his works? We have already said that Justice does not demand so much pain for so much sin, without regard to circumstances. Even human Justice considers the difference of condition, temptation and guilt; and that where the outward transgression is the same. Hence the difference which the law makes in killing, between murder and manslaughter, and the several degrees of manslaughter; and the sliding scale of punishment for the same crime, from months to years of imprisonment; and the pardoning power granted to the executive to correct mistakes, and release those on whom punishment has done the desired work of reformation.

So the Divine Justice adapts its punishment to the

life of sin and crime for 49 years and 364 days, and on the following day repents, dies, and goes to heaven. B lives a life of virtue and goodness for 49 years and 364 days, commits a crime on the following day, dies and goes to hell! One with fifty years of goodness, less one day, is punished with endless torment; the other with fifty years of wickedness, less one day, is rewarded with endless blessedness! Now if the first is punished for one sin through all eternity, how long, on the score of *Justice*, ought the other to be punished for fifty years of sin. And if *Justice* bestows heaven on the one good act of late and selfish repentance, what ought it to bestow on fifty years of good actions, done for their own sake?

Again: A and B are equally sinners—they quarrel, and A murders B.—of course B goes to hell—but A, through the labors of good men, repents, is hung, and goes to heaven. In this case the criminal gets to paradise by the lucky chance of being the murderer instead of the murdered. If his victim had been fortunate enough to strike the fatal blow he would have changed places with him; and so the eternal destiny of each would have been reversed by the chance blow of a street fight! And is this justice — *Divine Justice?* Is it on such grounds it distributes its rewards and punishments? What must be the moral influence of such a doctrine?

condition and needs of the offender, measuring them so exactly to the purpose aimed at, that no mistakes are ever made here. The sinner is rewarded according to his works, as the sick man is treated according to his disease. The skilful physician, as he sees the case requires, administers sometimes more and sometimes less medicine; and so the wise judge inflicts sometimes ten stripes, and sometimes five, for the same offence, according to the moral condition, the degree of hardness or depravity of the offender.

Whatever medicine is necessary to repair the injury caused by the disease, the sick man must take; whatever punishment is necessary to repair the injury caused by sin, the wicked man must suffer. Both must bear the penalty, as a warning to themselves and others, to be henceforth obedient to the law. The penalty is simply the method which Justice takes to reinstate all things in their original position, and keep them there; to vindicate the righteousness of the law, and the reason and necessity of obedience.

And this is precisely the definition of Justice which Clemens Alexandrinus, a learned Universalist Father, gave nearly seventeen hundred years ago, A. D., 190. "Justice," says he, "is, in itself, nothing but goodness; for it rewards the virtuous, and seeks the improvement of the sinful. It is the office of salutary justice, continually to exalt every thing towards the best state of which it is capable. Inferior things are adapted to promote and confirm the salvation of that which is most excellent; and thus whatever is endued with any virtue, is forthwith still changed for the better, through the liberty of choice which the mind has in its power. And the

necessary chastisements of the great Judge, who regards all with benignity, make mankind grieve for their sins and imperfections, and advance them through the various states of discipline to perfection. Even God's wrath, if so his admonitions may be called, is full of benevolence towards the human race; for whose sake the Word of God was made man." [1]

And with this agrees Origen, one of the greatest scholars, as well as one of the most distinguished Universalists, of the Ancient Church, A. D. 230. He says, "Justice is Goodness .... and when they allege that God, who rewards every one according to his deserts, renders evil to the evil, let them not conceal the principle (on which this is done)—that as the sick must be cured by harsh medicines, so God administers, for the purpose of emendation, what for the present is productive of pain." [2]

Thus the Justice of God, in its absolute character, and in its relative object and end, furnishes one of the most conclusive and unanswerable arguments for the final destruction of evil, and the restoration of moral order, for universal holiness and salvation. Its perpetual demand is, "Do right—abolish wrong—obey the law, or suffer the penalty till you do obey—an end of sin and of all evil, and the universal and everlasting reign of Righteousness—this only will satisfy my claims on mankind, and the end cannot

[1] *Stromata* Lib. vii. cap. 2; *Pædagog.* Lib. i. cap. 8.

[2] *De Principiis*, Lib. ii. cap. 5, § 3. Even Tertullian says, "*Nihil bonum, quod injustum; bonum autem omne quod justum est.*" Again he says: "Stultissimi, qui de humanis divina præjudicant, ut quoniam in homine corruptoriæ conditionis habentur hujusmodi passiones, idcirco et in Deo ejusdem status existimentur," &c. *Contra Marc* i. 25, 26; ii. 12. Hagenbach § 39.

come till this comes. Disorder, injustice, wrong, and wickedness, punishment and suffering, are not the end, not the thing the Divine Government rests in, but *Universal Order*, *Holiness*, and *Happiness*,—these, and only these, are final and forever, the divine offspring of Divine Justice!"

Hence the Lord himself says:—"*I am a just God and a Saviour*—there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return (i. e. shall be accomplished), that unto me every knee shall bow every tongue shall swear, surely shall say, In the Lord have I RIGHTEOUSNESS and strength—and all, that are incensed against him shall be ashamed."—Isaiah x. 20—25.

§ II. *Justice has claims on God as well as on man.* There is another side to this question of Justice, which is almost wholly ignored in the argument—viz: that it has claims on God as well as on man. Not only does justice demand that the sinner shall suffer for his sins, but also that he who created shall have dealt fairly with him in all that respects his moral and physical constitution, and the conditions of his life on earth, prior to his sin; and that he shall continue to in all the consequences and retributions following it. And God himself recognizes this principle in his moral administration of our affairs, and in all his dealings with mankind. This is admirably illustrated in the record of Abraham's pleading with the Almighty respecting the destruction of Sodom. Gen. xviii. 23—33. God replies to the question of

the patriarch: "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" and plainly admits the moral obligations implied in the question.

So he reasons with the Jews in the same way, and condescends even to defend his action toward them on the grounds of strict justice; and elaborates the arguments of defence at great length. Ezek. xviii. The conclusion comes in this form:—"And yet saith the house of Israel, the way of the Lord is not equal. O house of Israel! Are not my ways equal? Are not your ways unequal? Therefore, will I judge you, *every one according to his ways*, saith the Lord God." And similar passages are found throughout the Scriptures, acknowledging the law of justice as applicable to the divine conduct:—"Doth God pervert judgment? or doth the Almighty pervert justice?" "Far be it from God that he should do wickedness; and from the Almighty that he should commit iniquity. "Yea, surely God will not do wickedly; neither will the Almighty pervert judgment. He will not lay upon man more than is right, that he should enter into judgment with God."—Job viii. xxxiv. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne." "Righteous art thou, O Lord, and upright are thy judgments."—Psalms., lxxxix, cix., &c.

These passages show that God is governed by the strictest principles of honor and justice, in all his dealings with his creatures, acknowledging and respecting all their rights, and all their claims upon him to be treated with fairness and equity in all that involves the interests of the present and the future. Indeed, the government of God is not for the good of

the governor, but for the good of the governed; not to display the arbitrary power of Deity, but to promote the happiness of mankind.

And since, from the nature of the case, the subject of the government could not be consulted as to its form and principles, its laws and penalties; Justice requires that all these should be such as are fitted to secure the highest good of all concerned. If you act in my affairs without my knowledge or consent, you are bound to act fairly and honorably, for my benefit, and not to my injury. If God bestows on me an existence, which I am not allowed to refuse, whatever its responsibilities or perils, *Justice* demands that the existence thus forced upon me should prove a good and not an evil. If I could see, beforehand, that it would prove an endless curse to me, I should, of course, reject it, if the choice were given me. If God sees beforehand that it will prove an endless curse to me—no matter how or why; no matter by whose fault—it is a violation of justice in all its definitions to force it upon me.

But we will go farther than this, and suppose that he did *not* know that it would prove a final curse; was it right or just to create us with such a fearful issue as endless woe *possible* even? Without pushing the question of omniscience, suppose it possible that we might reach the glory and blessedness of heaven, ought we to be *compelled* to take the risk, however unwilling, when the alternative of failure is so awful? Let us resort to illustration again, that we may see it more clearly.

A frail and narrow bridge swings across a gulf that stretches fearful and fathomless below. On this,

as it rocks wildly in the winds, a father places his young child. Beyond, on the other side of the gulf, he has deposited a prize of gold and jewels above estimate, which he promises to the child if he passes the bridge safely; and then compels him to go, commanding him to look neither to the right nor to the left, but to be watchful and attentive; and firm of step. The boy heedless and disobedient, hesitates instead of going steadily forward—reels and staggers —the slight bridge quivers for a moment—swings from under him, and hurled as the lightning, into the gulf, he is caught and impaled on a sharp and jagged splinter of rock far down the abyss. There he hangs for days and weeks, for long and weary years, if possible, struggling and agonizing, and writhing in torture, and crying to his father for help and deliverance. But his father turns a deaf ear to all his entreaties, goes about his business wholly indifferent to the horrible sufferings of his child, and justifies himself by saying, "The boy *might* have passed the bridge safely, and won the prize—he was warned of the danger—it was his own fault that he fell, and he suffers justly!"

Now, would not Justice, Honor, Humanity,—would not all men and angels, pronounce this father a monster and a fiend; and reprobate his conduct as the essence of injustice and cruelty? Would not every one say there was no necessity for such a proceeding, no excuse for the awful risk to which the child was thus wantonly exposed?

And shall God place me on the frail and narrow bridge of Life, stretched, as it is, over the awful and flaming abyss of endless p lition, with the bare pos-

sibility of a heaven beyond; and then leave me there to walk it, swinging fearfully to and fro in the winds and tempests of temptation, till, faint with terror, at last I make a false step, and am percipitated into the fathomless sea of fire below? Why give life with such awful hazard? I would not choose it, nor take it, if left to my own freedom. I would not willingly cross the frail and unsteady bridge, swaying in the wind with so many thousand chances against me—whatever the prize—not for the possibility of ten thousand heavens.

Uncreated I suffered nothing, I lost nothing, I ran no risk. Why drag me forth from nothingness without my consent, and force me upon the perilous life-bridge, and then leave me to fall headlong into the bottomless abyss of torment, torment beyond measure, and without end? Does not the moral sense of every man cry out against this? Does not Justice, with all her voices, protest against it? Assuredly so. There was no need to subject me to this terrible risk —nothing that demanded it; and there is nothing that can justify or excuse it. And if God has done this, the plea which Young, in "The Last Day," has put into the mouth of the damned sinner in hell, would tell with terrible effect on the Divine Justice as well as Mercy:

"Father of Mercies! why from silent earth
Didst thou awake and *curse me into birth?*
Tear me from quiet, ravish me from night,
And make a thankless present of thy light?
Push into being a reverse of thee,
And animate a clod with misery?
The beasts are happy; they come forth and keep
Short watch on earth, and then lie down to sleep.
* * * * * *

But our dire punishment forever strong,
Our constitution too forever young,
Cursed with returns of vigor still the same,
Powerful to bear and satisfy the flame;
Still to be caught and still to be pursued;
To perish still, and still to be renewed!
And this my Help, my God at thy decree:
Nature is changed and Hell should succor me!
And canst thou, then look down from perfect bliss,
And see me plunging in this dark abyss?
Calling thee Father, in a sea of fire?
Or pouring blasphemies at thy desire?
With mortal's anguish wilt thou raise thy name?
And by my pangs omnipotence proclaim?"

The Divine Justice, therefore, is not only an eloquent and unanswerable protest against the doctrine of endless pain and punishment; but it is an equally conclusive argument that all the issues of the divine government under which we have been placed, will be beneficent, and that every living soul shall at last have abundant cause to rejoice that it was created. And so will be fulfilled the prophecy and the promise already quoted,—"I am a *Just* God and a *Saviour* . . . unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, surely shall say, *In the Lord have I righteousness and strength.*"

SECTION VI.

GOD THE FATHER OF ALL MEN.

But God is not only represented in the Scriptures as the Creator of man, perfect in power, and wisdom, and goodness, and justice; but he has also declared himself as sustaining toward us the intimate and

tender relation of Parent. And in this revelation he announces himself as assuming all the obligations, and possessing all the affections for us, implied by that name and relation.

By the apostle Paul, we have the witness that there is "one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. iv.; and again, that "to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him." 1 Cor. viii. "The Lord, the God of the Spirits of all flesh." Num. xvi., xxvii. And, again, we have the salutation: "Grace be to you, and peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father: to whom be glory forever and ever." Gal. i. And the Saviour has given to the world a beautiful formula of prayer, beginning with, "Our Father, which art in heaven."[1]

[1] It may be thought that John viii. 37—45, requires some notice, since here Jesus not only seems to deny that God was the Father of the unbelieving Jews, but expressly declares the devil to be their father. But he is speaking in this case simply of moral resemblance, or likeness in character. They were children of the devil, or the devil was their father, because they were alike in character. The devil was "a murderer from the beginning," and "ye seek to kill me;" "he is a liar, and the father of it," and ye choose a lie, for "I tell you the truth, and ye believe me not;" and thus "ye are of your father the devil." As they were in moral character or resemblance the children of the devil, so they could not, *in this respect*, claim God as their Father, for there was no likeness between them. Verses 39, 40 explain the meaning:—"If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham;" just as he says, verse 42, "If God were your Father, ye would love me." Of course they *were* Abraham's children by nature or descent; but they were not morally, because Abraham was distinguished for his faith, and they for their unbelief

But God is not only bound to mankind by the ties and affections of a parent, but he has also established over them the authority and discipline of parental government. He has set up his laws and declared his commandments, what he requires us to do, and what he forbids us to do; and he calls upon us to obey him, with the assurance that obedience brings peace and happiness, and disobedience sorrow and pain. The faithful will find favor in his sight, and the rebellious will incur the penalties of the law. But the law and the penalty, the discipline and punishment, are all the offspring of parental wisdom and love. God governs his great family of intelligent offspring for *their* good, and not for his own. The commandments are for their benefit, not for his; and

So they were God's children by nature or creation, but not morally or by faith and obedience. The Saviour just as much denies the fatherhood of Abraham, as the fatherhood of God. The fact is, that the primal parental relation by nature, both of God and of Abraham, exists independent of the moral or spiritual relation. The one is a resemblance in character; the other is the necessity of creation and birth, and cannot be changed nor abolished. A child may be very disobedient and sinful, but that does not annul his relationship to his parent. The fact that he is a child is in the nature of things, and cannot be changed by any act either of the father or of the child.

The figure in question, is very common in the Scriptures as for example: "Children of light," and "children of darkness," "son of thunder," "son of perdition,' "son of consolation," &c.; and in the language of the day, we have "Sons of Temperance," "Daughters of Charity," "Sisters of Mercy," and like forms of speech, expressive of character and action. The language of Jesus no more implies the personality of the devil, than these names imply the personality of Light, Consolation, Temperance and Charity. If it be said that the same reasoning would disprove the personality of God, I answer, No; for the personality of God does not depend on a name or a relation. The existence of man, the earth, the physical creation, are the witnesses of God's existence and personality.

the chastisements of disobedience are corrective, and not in anger.

The Father rises above the Lawgiver and the Judge, and all other relations of God to man are subordinate to this. The divine love of the Parent is the source out of which comes the Divine Government, the centre from which all action toward man originates. No language is too strong or intensive to express the greatness and tenderness of the Father's affection for his children; for as the apostle says: "Neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Rom. viii.

He is the fountain of life, and light and joy, to all his intelligent creatures. By day and by night he cares for us; from the cradle to the grave, he watches for us, and suffers no real evil to come nigh to us. Our sorrows and trials are not evil, but ministers of good to us, though for a little they walk with us in disguise. All that we suffer is ordered in a love whose tenderness is equalled only by its wisdom. And he has told us that he will never abandon his children, whatever darkness may cloud the mind, whatever hardness may come upon the heart. They may forsake him, but he is still a father; and the golden cord of parental affection is too strong ever to be broken. His infinite energy cannot he exhausted, nor his Spirit wearied, in his efforts to recover the lost, lift up the fallen, and reform the sinful. And he will not stay the work of regeneration and redemption, until he has rebuilt every ruined soul in its

original fair proportions, in all its primal symmetry and beauty.[1]

And how luminously all this is written out on the sacred page, as a part of the Divine religion of Jesus. "Every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." James i.17 He is the same in his infinite goodness toward his children, "yesterday, to-day, and forever," whatever their waywardness or ingratitude, or sinfulness; for change in them works no change in him. Hence the beautiful and affecting witness of Jesus: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and do good to them that hate you, *that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven;* for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust. Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Matt. v. Can language go further than this in exhibition of the love of the Divine Parent toward his children,

[1] FREDERICA BREMER, who is a believer in the final restoration, states this point in eloquent words:—"*God is Love.* He will, therefore never cease to desire the delivery of every soul of man; here, there, in eternity, he will labor for it. God is the only principle ever the same, ever active. O! certainly the time will come when the Son, the Eternal Word, shall have subdued all to the Father, the Eternal Mind." "God, the eternally good, the highest love, will he forsake his fallen, his wretched child? Will he do less than an earthly mother for her own? O, no; he will never turn away his face; he will seek his child; he will call to him; he will suffer; he will give his heart's blood to win him again, to unite him again to himself. If God lives in holier worlds as a dispenser of blessedness, he must live on earth as a reconciler. The hymn of regret and homesickness which has arisen on earth from time immemorial—this inward cry, 'Come, Lord!' is from everlasting to everlasting answered with, 'Here, my child!'"

even his "evil and unjust" children? And is it not such patient and forgiving love as this that makes us ashamed of our sins, when once we come fairly to see and comprehend it? Is not this the "goodness of God that leadeth us to repentance," when the knowledge and belief of it have once made their way into the heart?

And with what power are we drawn to him, with what attractive force his parental love comes out to meet us, what confidence and trust are inspired within us, when the blessed Son and Saviour reveals to us the value and preciousness which our Father sets upon us as his children, and the special care with which he provides for all our needs: — "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink. Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns, yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these! Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Therefore take no thought, saying, what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed; for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you." Matt. vi. And again he says: — "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one

of them is forgotten before God; but even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows." [1] Luke xii. 6-7.

All this is intended to show the nearness of God to us, and the watchful tenderness with which he follows us in all our ways. It is designed to establish the fact that the parental relation is real, and not in name; and that God, being our Father, feels for us the love of a Father, and, so to speak, discharges all the duties of a father. He anticipates and provides for every want, he guards from every danger, and in everything he seeks the best good of his family. He withholds no real privilege or blessing which they seek, he grants, freely, every wish consistent with the individual and general welfare; and only refuses when he sees that the thing desired and prayed for in our ignorance and blindness would be an injury, and not a good. He often denies what we ask, but it is because "we know not what we should pray for as we ought." He deals with us as a wise and kind earthly parent often deals with his inexperienced children: refusing this, however earnestly sought for, and compelling that, however disagreeable and painful, knowing that his knowledge is better than the child's, and content to wait until time and experience shall justify the wisdom and goodness of his course.

And this truth, that God gives to his children only what is good, and never what is really evil, the Sa-

[1] CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS has a very beautiful figure illustrative of this thought. He says, "As the parent bird follows and seeks out its young which have fallen from the nest, so God the Father follows and seeks out his fallen children."

viour illustrates with equal force and beauty:—"If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give good things, and the Holy Spirit, to them that ask him!" Luke xi., Matt. vii. Thus he shows how God, being truly a parent, bestows all real temporal and spiritual blessings on those whom he has formed in his own image. And at the same time, he reveals the blessed truth, that God is "much more" a Father to his children, than it is possible for any earthly parent to be. Man is weak; but God is almighty, and can do all his love desires for the welfare of his offspring. Man is capricious and changeable; but God is always the same, without variableness. Man is imperfect; but God is perfect. The human parent *may* be unfaithful and forget; but the Divine Parent — never. And the words spoken to Israel by God himself, are of universal application: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands." Isa. xlix.

Such are the Scriptural representations of the parental relation of God to man. And that they are intended to inform us, that, in the maintenance of this relation, he will regard the highest welfare of his whole family, and of every humblest individual of it. that he *must*, indeed, do this, as the necessity of his

love, cannot admit of a doubt. Nothing in the Bible can be plainer than the sublime truth of God's universal Fatherhood; and this being true, nothing can be plainer than the utter antagonism to this of the doctrine of endless punishment.

The idea of an *earthly* father, if he had the power, keeping his child in endless existence only that he might inflict upon him endless torture, is too monstrously absurd and wicked to require refutation! And where is the son or daughter who, if any one were to accuse their earthly father of cherishing such a purpose, or of being guilty of such atrocious cruelty, would not rise up with burning indignation to repel the charge, and silence the slanderer? And yet thousands hear this cruel accusation against their *heavenly* Father, who is so much more to them than any human parent can ever be; and they not only do not rebuke, but even accept and believe, the shocking blasphemy against the Holy Spirit of truth and love! What argument is needed, what argument is possible, here? It is all embraced in a single sentence:—If God be the Father of men, as the Bible asserts, then endless punishment *can not* be true. If it be true, then is God *not* the Father of men; and the beautiful sayings of Jesus, which we have repeated here, are only as a dream of the night!

But in this presentation of the case we do not, of course, ignore the fact already stated, that God punishes the disobedient and wicked; but we insist that he punishes as a Father, with no feeling or object inconsistent with parental love, or the highest interests of the sufferer; in a word, that he punishes only for correction. And with what truth and force this is

set out by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? Furthermore, we have had fathers of the flesh who chastened us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits *and live?* For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; *but He for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness.* Now, no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, *afterward* it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby." Chap. xii. 5-11.

No comment is needed on a statement so direct and clear as this. God, as a Father, exercises parental control over his family; he compels respect to his government, because that government is established for the security and happiness of his children. He punishes those who disobey his laws, but for their profit, that they may repent of their sins, and become partakers of his holiness. And if we can reverence our fathers of the flesh, who sometimes chasten us capriciously, or for their own pleasure; how much rather ought we to be in subjection to the Father of our spirits, that we may live. And thus again is affirmed the superiority of the love of our heavenly Parent over that of earthly parents; and, also, that the chastisements of God are corrective, *that we may*

live, having an *afterward* of the peaceable fruits of righteousness.[1]

And this is only what we have a right to expect, both from the parental character of God, and from the very genius and object of government itself. All true governments on earth, seek, as their aim and end, the prosperity, growth and happiness, of the people in their charge. Every family government that has a right to be, proposes, as its sole object, the best education, the noblest character, the largest usefulness and happiness of every son and daughter. So of the Divine Government, whether regal as of the king, or parental as of the father; it can only aim at, can only be satisfied with, the highest good and happiness of all who are its subjects. And, in the accomplishment of this, whatever pains or penalties, whatever restraint, or discipline, or severity, may be necessary, will be sanctioned alike by wisdom and affection.

And what a pathetic and instructive illustration of this whole subject of the Divine Fatherhood and Government, is furnished in the beautiful parable of The Prodigal Son. Luke xv. The father knew well enough the folly and wilfulness of his son, and that nothing but the bitter experience to which he was blindly and obstinately hurrying, could reform and correct him. And so he left him to himself, left him (as God often leaves his children,) to gather into his bosom the fruits of his folly and sin; left him to the desolation, and anguish, and curse, of his guilty life. But all this while the father's heart remained

[1] See this subject discussed at length in Chapter viii.

the same in its love; all this while the father's house was open to receive the returning prodigal; and the fatted calf, and the ring, and the purple robe, awaited his coming. And when, at last, suffering and punishment had accomplished the work of humiliation and repentance, when the fiery scourge of judgment had swept his blindness and his sin clean away from him, and he arose and went with humbled and yearning heart toward his home, we see the unchanged tenderness of the father's heart through all that past of sin and shame, as he hurried to meet him afar off, and fell upon his neck and kissed him! And in this sweet parable of Jesus, we see, also, as he meant we should see, the heart of God, the compassion and tenderness of the Divine Father toward his erring and sinful children.

Is it possible, then, to doubt the results of his parental government? Is it possible to doubt that finally, through joy and sorrow, through hope and fear, through rewards and punishments, through the wisdom of discipline and the profit of experience, it will end in universal correction and restoration? Is it possible to believe otherwise than that the infinitely wise and good Father, with infinite resources at his command, will so govern, and guide, and educate his children, that at last they shall be made wise unto salvation; and, returned from all their wanderings, purified from all evil, be renewed in the image of the heavenly forevermore!

And with what beauty Tennyson expresses his hope of this, in his "In Memoriam:"—

"Oh, yes, we trust that somehow good
Will be the final goal of ill,
To pangs of nature, sins of will,
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood!

That nothing walks with aimless feet,
That not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete.

Behold! we know not any thing;
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last *to all*,
And every winter change to spring."

And he completes the picture in the following exquisite lines, relative to the final and universal harmony resulting from God's government:

"That God which ever lives and loves,
One God, one law, one element,
And one far off, divine event,
To which *the whole creation* moves!"

This ends the Scriptural and logical presentation of the argument for Universal holiness and happiness, founded on the character of God as Creator and Father, and on the Divine attributes of Power, Wisdom, Goodness, and Justice.

It will be seen that each attribute furnishes an argument in itself, as regards the intention and will of God in the creation of mankind; and that, taken together, they demonstrate the harmony of the Divine perfections in the original plan, and in the progressive work of redemption. God is forever at one with himself. Power and Wisdom, Goodness and Justice, unite in the demand for the final abolition of sin and evil, and for the universal triumph and eter-

nal reign of good. He is the Universal Father, and he will never abandon his children, nor cease to love them, nor cease to act in their behalf, until the last wandering sheep is restored to the fold, and the work of redemption is complete.

But how is this redemption to be accomplished? What are the agencies by which sin is to be put away, and the race of man delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God? The Bible reveals the fact that God, in the scheme of redemption, works through appointed means, by instrumentalities, and by agents specially chosen and consecrated for the purpose. He is the source of truth and knowledge; from him proceed all grace and spiritual power; but he bestows these divine gifts on his Son Jesus Christ, and sends him into the world, that through him the world may be saved. God is, indeed, "the Saviour of all men;" but he saves them through Christ and his Gospel; and hence Christ is also called "the Saviour of the world," and the Gospel "the power of God unto salvation."

We are, therefore, led by the natural development and connection of the argument to consider next, the nature and person of Christ, his office, the sacrifice of his death, the atonement, and his relation to the world as its Redeemer.

CHAPTER II.

CHRIST — HIS NATURE, OFFICE AND ATONEMENT.

SECTION I.

§ I. *The person and office of Christ. His exalted character and pre-existence.* — Throughout the Scriptures, Jesus is represented as the Son of God, and this is the title which he claims for himself, and never anything higher than this. But it is plain enough, from the usage of this expression in connection with the Saviour, that it has a larger and deeper meaning than the same or similar language when applied to others. The phrases "sons of God," "children of God," &c., are often used to designate believers in the truth, or those who obey the truth; but the "Son of God," when applied to Jesus, is significant of something more than faith and obedience. It is obviously expressive of character, position, spiritual power, and a special relation to God.

Hence he is said to be "heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, upholding all things by the word of his power." Heb. i. This is never said of believers, nor of any other beings; nor is it written of any but Jesus, that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. ii. 9. And constantly he is spoken of in the

Bible as something more than man; as standing in a peculiar relation both to God and to us; as one to whom the spirit was given "without measure," and having "all power in heaven and in earth." John iii., Matt. xxviii. It is he whom "God hath exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour," Acts v. 31; "being made so much better than the angels, as he hath, by inheritance, obtained a more excellent name than they." Heb. i. 4. And this name is "above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii. 9—11.

Such language as this, which abounds in the New Testament, is never employed in reference to any other created being. It reveals to us the fact that Jesus is indeed "the first born of every creature, . . . that in all things he might have the pre-eminence," Col. i.; that he was endued with Divine wisdom and knowledge, gifted with miraculous power, and sent into the world on a special mission, that through his life, and teachings, and grace, he might save the world; and through his death and resurrection, "might abolish death," and bring into the light, the glorious fact of "life and immortality," and thus "deliver those who, through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage." 2 Tim. i., Heb. ii.

His nature was both divine and human. He is the "Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," 1 Tim. ii. 5; claiming to be both the "Son

of God," and the "Son of man." John viii. 40. He stands between us, with one hand reaching up to God, and with the other reaching down to man, and thus bringing us together, and reconciling the world to God.

There are many passages which seem to intimate very strongly, his pre-existence, his personality prior to his appearance in the flesh, his dwelling with the Father from the beginning. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." "Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am." John xvii., viii. Again he says: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." John iii. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye, through his poverty, might be rich.' 2. Cor. viii. "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God (more properly, "thought it not to be sought after to be equal with God; i. e. was content to be in the likeness of God, without seeking to be his equal), but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man." Phil. ii. "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." John i. "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, . . . for verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Heb ii.

Now all these passages certainly look strongly in the direction of pre-existence. I am not ignorant of the current criticism of these texts, but the most natural and easy interpretation, it would seem, even in the face of prejudice, is, that Christ existed personally with the Father, before he came into this world as the Saviour of men. His own language that he had glory with the Father *before the world was*, that he *was in heaven*, and *came down from heaven*, that he was *older than Abraham* (for this, and not pre-eminence, was the point of the argument of the Jews—"Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, "Verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am,") — all this, surely, is in evidence that the Saviour had personal existence before the creation of mankind.

And the language of the apostles seems founded on this belief—"he *was* rich, yet *became* poor;" and "*took upon him* the form of a servant," which implies a prior individuality and choice, on his part, as to the conditions of his earthly life. *He took part* in flesh and blood voluntarily, the Word *was made flesh*, and dwelt among us, &c.; which shows that there was a spiritual existence before that in the flesh, which was taken, accepted, for the sake of saving those of like nature.

At all events, this seems a legitimate conclusion from the passages quoted; and if the interpretation be correct, it gives a point and meaning to the expressions already cited, that he is both "the Son of God," and "the Son of Man," "the only begotten of the Father," the "first born of every creature," and that "when he bringeth in the first begotten into the

world, he saith, And let *all the angels of God* worship him." Heb. i. 6.

It must be plain to every reader of the New Testament, that Christ is regarded as a being by himself, different from all others. He is not God nor an angel, nor an archangel, nor a man in the ordinary definition and understanding of that word.[1] On no other supposition does the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews seem capable of intelligible interpretation. The whole force of the argument lies in this superiority of Christ to human and angelic natures. He is exalted above all others, sitting "at the right hand of the Majesty on high," "far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion." Eph. i. 21; Heb. i. He is in the counsels of God, he is the representative of God as no other one is; and of him only could such an expression be lawfully used, as God "manifest in the flesh." 1. Tim. iii. 16. And though believers are said to be "begotten of God," and are called "sons of God," yet of Christ alone is it said that, in a special and higher sense he is the *only* begotten Son of the Father." John i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18. In him the divine and human elements were mingled as they are not in any other created being; and by this peculiar union of God and man in his nature, he is pre-eminently fitted for the great work of instructing, elevating, and saving mankind. And it is through him

[1] One of the most eminent of the Universalist fathers, CLEMENT, says of the *nature* of Christ, after setting him apart from men and angels: "It is the most perfect, the most holy, the most divine, the chiefest the most kingly βασιλικωτάτη, and the most beneficent; and, before all, nearest to that of Him, who is alone almighty." *Strom.* vii. 2. Hagenbach. § 42.

that we have access to the Father: "I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me." John xiv. 6.

He is more to us than an example. He is authoritative truth. He is the Light and Life of the world. He has life in himself, and he imparts spiritual life to the believer, through faith. We are renewed by him, and healed by his touch. When we truly believe in him, we are sanctified by this belief; we are quickened into new life by the magnetism of his spirit. We live in him, as he lives in God. He is the Wisdom of God, and the power of God, to us; they flow into our souls through him, by faith; and so in him, and by him, we are united to God, and God dwells in us, and we in him.[1]

§ II. *Christ not God—The Trinity.* While we believe in, and rejoicingly acknowledge, the pre-eminence of Christ in all things, we reject the doctrine of his Deity, or his equality with God. There is nothing in the Scriptures to justify the assertion that "in the unity of the Godhead, there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost—the Father being of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son." The whole sweep of the Old and New

[1] It is proper to say that in the above statement respecting the nature of Christ, especially in what pertains to his pre-existence, I speak for myself only. The denomination as such is not committed to these views; though they are probably largely entertained. The utmost freedom prevails in regard to speculative doctrine. Some may give to Jesus a higher positon, a nearer relation to God, than that of the text; and others may look upon him only as "the *man* Christ Jesus," specially gifted for a special work.

Testaments is in opposition to this dogma, and while God is declared to be one and indivisible, Christ is always represented to be subordinate to, and dependent on God, in all that he teaches and all that he works. "There be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many and lords many,) but to us there is but *one God, the Father*, of whom are all things, and we in him."—1 Cor. viii.

There may be a few texts, here and there, the phraseology of which might be forced into seeming proof of the Deity of Christ; but if the doctrine were true, it would not be left to rest on a few doubtful passages or phrases, or on mere verbal criticisms, as its only support. Let us briefly examine a few of these.

I. *Criticism of Texts cited to prove the Trinity.* (1.) Isaiah ix. 6, 7. "*For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given,*" &c. Note the following particulars: — 1. "A son is *given*," and therefore connot be the same with him who gives. 2. The Son being called by the name of the Father, does not prove him to be the same person as the Father, any more than the giving an earthly father's name to his son, proves the son to be his father. Those to whom the word of God came, were called gods, John x. 35; but this did not imply their equality with Jehovah. 3. All this honor in the way of titles, and power in the extension of his government, is from the Lord of hosts; showing very clearly, that the person referred to, and the Lord of hosts, are not the same.

(2.) Heb. i. 9, 10. "*Unto the Son he saith,* (who saith? the Son himself?) *Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever.*"

Obviously the person who says this, and the person to whom it is said, are two persons, and not one. And in the next verse we see the supreme Deity; "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, *even* thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Now, if Christ be called God here, yet there is another who is *his* God, his superior, anointing him for his holy office, and placing him above his fellows. He who does this, and he to whom it is done, are distinct beings, the one subordinate to the other; or the language is without sense or meaning.

(3.) John x. 30. "*I and my Father are one.*" Not in person nor in substance, but in thought and purpose respecting the salvation of the world. "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be *one flesh.*" Matt. xix. What language is stronger than this? but in what sense are husband and wife one flesh? Are they one *person* only, or two persons, who are one in affections, aims and labors?

The same thought is expressed in 1 Cor. iii. 8. "I have planted, Apollos watered. . . . Now he that planteth, and he that watereth, are one." Did Paul mean to say that he and Apollos were the same person? or that they were one spirit dwelling in two bodies? Of course not; but only that with one purpose and will, they were working to one end, viz: The promotion of Christian truth, and the Christian life, in the Corinthian church. And hence he argues that there should be no divisions, no strifes, among the believers; but that they should all labor together for the Gospel as it is in Jesus.

In chapter xvii. Jesus prays respecting his disciples, "that they may be one, *as we are.*" Did he mean that the twelve should be one person only, or one in spirit and love, one in the work of salvation, as he and the Father were? So in the 21st verse he prays that all believers "may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." That is, one in mind and heart; otherwise being one with God would make thirteen or fourteen, instead of three, persons in the Godhead.

(4.) 1 John v. 7. "*For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.*"

Admitting the genuineness of this text, its meaning is obviously the same with that of the preceding, "I and my Father are one;" i. e. one in their witness to the truth of the Divine love and grace as manifested in the Gospel; one in spirit and purpose touching the redemption of mankind. See the context. But the text is, beyond question, an interpolation, as Manuscripts and Versions abundantly demonstrate.[1]

(5.) Col. i. 15—20. "*Who is the image of the invisible God. . . . For by him were all things created that are in heaven,*" &c. This is very strong language, but observe: 1. He of whom this is spoken is not the invisible supreme God, but the *image* of him. The likeness or portrait of a person, is not the person himself. 2. Immediately following this, we have this statement: "For it pleased *the Father* that in him should all fulness dwell," &c. Here the

[1] See the author's "Christianity against Infidelity." 2d edition, page 192.

distinction between the Father as supreme, and the Son as subordinate, is set forth again. It is all according to the pleasure of the Father; and the very creative and redeeming fulness of the Son dwells in him by the Father's appointment, and is derived from the Father.

(6.) Rom. ix. 5. "*Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.*"

This is simply an exclamation. The allusion to the incarnation of Jesus, brings out the phrase of thanksgiving—"God blessed forever," or "Blessed be God forever." The expression of Thomas is in the same line, when, putting his finger into the wounded side, he exclaimed, "My Lord! and my God!" John xx. 27.

(7.) John i. 1–14. "*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God,*" &c.

Allowing this to refer to Christ personally, and not to the Divine Wisdom or Energy taking human form in him, we still see the distinction of person kept up. We cannot suppose that the Word was God in the same sense it is said to be *with* God. A person cannot properly be said to be with himself. But the distinction is definitely stated, in the usual form, in verse 14: The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Here the Word is the only begotten of the Father; but he who begets is not surely the same person with him who is begotten — the one gives life, and the

other receives life — and the first is certainly antecedent to the last. But the simple intention of John is undoubtedly to declare, that the Word, *Logos*, the Divine Energy or Wisdom, was with God as an attribute, a part of his being; and was God, in the sense in which a man's thought, or his mind, may be said to be the man himself. This Word, or Spiritual Energy,[1] "was made flesh," or, in other words, dwelt in Jesus; it was the spirit "without measure" given unto him by the Father, and through the inspiration of which he was "full of grace and truth."

(8.) 1 John v. 20. "*And we know the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true*, even *in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.*"

Can any one, who has no theory to defend, persuade himself that the phrases "the Son of God is come," and "this is the true God," refer to the same person? Can the true God be the Son of himself? Our translators have supplied the word "even," making "him that is true," and "his Son Jesus Christ" the same. But the word "and" is equally authorized, and more consistent: "We are in him that is true," i. e. God the Father, "*and* in his Son Jesus Christ." *This* is the *true* God," who? The God of whom he had been speaking all along, prior to this verse, and whose Son "is come, and hath given us understanding, that we may *know* him that

[1] ORIGEN, who believed in the "eternal generation" of the Son, and even calls him a second God, δεύτερος θεός, still insists on his inferiority to the Father in essence and rank. He is worthy of all honor, after the God of the universe, μετὰ τόν θεόν τῶν ὅλων. *Contra Celsum* and *De Orat.*

is true," i. e. know him whom the Son reveals to be the true God; and this is "eternal life." The same idea, and the same words almost, are in the gospel xvii. 3: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

(9.) Phil. ii. 6. "*Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.*' Archbishop Newcome gives the true sense:—"Did not eagerly covet to be equal with God." The word rendered "robbery," signifies the thing stolen, the prey, the object seized; and the simple meaning of the language is, that Jesus, though in the form and likeness of God, did not think he should eagerly seize on, or assume, an equality with God; but, so far from such unholy ambition, "made himself of no reputation, and took upon himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." The present translation completely defeats the object of the apostle, which was to teach a lesson of humility, from the example of Christ. But what humility was there in aspiring to be equal with God? "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." The whole point of the exhortation lies in the fact that Christ, being in the likeness or form of God, did *not* seek to be equal with God, but "took upon himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man, and humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also highly exalted him," &c. Verses 5–11. But how could God highly *exalt* him if he was already equal to God? And how could it be said that God exalted him at all, if he himself were God?

II. *Scriptural proof against the Deity of Christ.* Let us come now to the positive proof that Christ is not the supreme God, but subordinate to, and dependent on him, for all things.

(1.) *Jesus always acknowledged the supremacy of the Father, and his own dependence on him.*

"My Father is greater than I." John xiv. When he said "*my* Father," did he mean himself? did he mean that he was greater than himself? or greater when acting as Father than when acting as Son? What is the honest interpretation of such language? "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do." John v. What would the people infer from this — that he who uttered it was the Almighty God? "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John vii. Are we to understand from this that in the capacity of Father he sent himself in the capacity of Son; and that while his doctrines were not his own as the sent, they were his own as the sender? "As my Father taught me, I speak these things." John viii. "To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." Matt. xx. Yet if he were God, it was his to give. "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but my Father only." Mark xiii., Matt. xxiv. But if the Father and Son were the same being, it was not possible that he should *not* know as Son what he knew as Father. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Matt. xxvii. Was this cry of anguish and desolation addressed to himself?

These are examples of the direct and positive asser-

tions of Jesus himself, that he was only the servant and agent of God, by whose authority and help he said and did everything. He does not know all things, all times and events — this infinite knowledge belongs to the Father only. All his doctrines and miracles are from one greater than himself, who alone is almighty and all-wise. He is not God, but the Son of God, and all wisdom and power are given him of the Father. And in confirmation of this he continually expressed the sense of his dependence on God by prayer. "He continued all night in prayer to God." Luke vi. "Sit ye here while I go and pray." Matt. xxvi., Mark i. vi., Luke v. ix. xxii. If he were God what is the meaning of this praying? Would he seek of himself the power and guidance and support, which he knew he already possessed in himself? Was the prayer in spirit or in form only? a true expression of weakness and dependence on his part, or a deception practised on those who followed him?

(2.) *The conduct and testimony of his disciples show that they did not believe him to be God.*

It is not possible to believe that the twelve, who were continually with him, really supposed they were keeping company with the almighty Jehovah, tabernacled in a human body; eating, drinking, sleeping, walking and conversing with him. If they did believe that Jesus was actually the omnipotent, omniscient God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe; they were the most extraordinary men the world ever saw, and their conduct towards him sets at defiance all the ordinary principles upon which we interpret human action.

Can any reasonable man convince himself that the

disciples, impressed with the tremendous fact that this Jesus was the great God himself, would, as they did, argue with him, advise, reprove, betray, deny and forsake him, with cowardly fear, in the presence of his human enemies? Could they have been so free and familiar in their intercourse with him? could they have lost their faith in him, and abandoned their work in despair, if all the while they knew he was the Lord Almighty? Do the simple and plain narratives of the Gospels *anywhere* — not to say *everywhere*, as they would, if it were true—indicate to the reader that the men who wrote, wrote under the pressure of the awful and ever present thought, that they were giving us the history of God's life on earth? of the sayings and doings of the Infinite Jehovah whom they knew, and with whom they met and talked, face to face, for the space of three years?

They always speak of him as inferior and subject ϖ God; as sent, anointed, inspired, directed, supported, exalted, raised from the dead by God; as the agent, servant, the Son, the Beloved of God; as a Mediator, a Priest, a Man, the Image, the Begotten, the First-born of God. "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature." "This Jesus hath God raised." "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost." "When all things shall be subdued under him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Tim. ii., Col. i., Acts ii., x., xvii., 1 Cor. xv. &c.

This language applied everywhere to Christ is

wholly irreconcileable with the supposition that the writers believed him to be the only living and true God, supreme in all things. Look at the last two passages from the stand-point of the Trinity, that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are one and the same being—"God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost," i. e., God anointed God with God. Is this what Peter intended to say? Is this what the Jews and Gentiles understood him to say? and was it to this unintelligible doctrine that Cornelius and his family were converted?

Then the Son being subject to him who put all things under him, that God may be all in all. Did Paul really write this under the impression that the subject Son and the God who is all in all, were one and the same? that he who put all things under Jesus, was this Jesus himself? and that when in a preceding verse he speaks of his "delivering up the kingdom to God, even the Father," he was himself the God and Father to whom he delivered up the kingdom?

Surely there is but one fair and honest interpretation of such language from the lips of the disciples and apostles; and that is, that it was spoken out of an unquestioning conviction on their part, that he was the Son and not the Father in any sense, subordinate to God, coming from him and returning to him; receiving his power and wisdom, his kingdom and all things from God, and finally surrendering all things back again to him. And since they were constantly with him, and heard all his public testimonies, and all his private conversations, and therefore certainly had the best means of knowing his true char-

acter, we think it safe to follow them in faith, and accept their verdict in the case.

(3.) *Christ expressly and positively denied that he was God, when charged with claiming to be so by the Jews.*

"Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." John v. 17–23. Now, how did Jesus meet this false inference from his language? He did say that God was his Father, and the Jews pretended from this that he made himself equal with God, in the same sense that the son, come to manhood, is the equal with his father. The point is, that by claiming God as his Father, he claimed —*not that he was God himself*, for parent and child are not one, or the same person, but — that he was, in all respects, of the same nature and essence with God; as the son is, in all respects, of the same nature, and, mentally and bodily, the equal of his father.

But *even this* the Saviour promptly and directly denies. He assures the Jews that he does not claim to be of the same nature and essence with God, or his equal in anything, because he calls God his Father. God is self-existent; and he is begotten and created. God is of himself all in all; and he is dependent. God has spiritual life in himself; but to him it is given. Then answered Jesus and said unto them, "Verily I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do. . . . . I can of mine own self do nothing; as I hear I judge," &c. Ver. 30. Nothing is plainer than that Jesus here rebuts the false charge of making himself

equal with God, by acknowledging that he was wholly dependent upon him; deriving from him his life, knowledge, and miraculous powers, and doing only those things that the Father gave him authority to do in his name.[1]

But there is another passage even more direct to the point than this, where the Jews accused him of claiming to be not equal with God, but God himself. The record of the occasion and circumstances is in John x. 30–38. Jesus had said in their presence, "I and my Father are one," whereupon they "took up stones to stone him;" and Jesus asking why they stoned him, they answered, "For blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."

Now, how did Jesus meet this charge? If he were really God, the charge was true, and this was the time, of all others, to declare his Deity. The occasion, his character, the truth, everything demanded that he should assert openly that he *was* God the Almighty, if this were the fact. Does he do this? Does he say plainly, "It is *not* blasphemy for me to make myself God, for *I am God!*" No; not a word of this sort; but the record says:—"Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word

[1] And this reply and denial of Jesus shows the error of the translation in Phil. ii. 6. "Who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God." This is what he was accused of by the Jews, and expressly repudiates. If he "thought it not robbery to be equal with God," if he *was* equal with God, why did he deny it to the Jews? Why did he not rather admit the fact, and defend it instead of saying, "I can do nothing of myself."

of God came, and the Scriptures cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest because I said, *I am the Son of God?*"

Here is a direct and unqualified denial of the charge that he was God, and a re-assertion of the old truth that he was only the Son of God; and that this was all he intended by the words to which they had taken exception—"I and my Father are one."[1] Now if Jesus was truly God, how could he meet the charge in this way? How can the Trinitarian, after this reply of the Saviour, still maintain that he is God, without virtually charging him with dishonesty? And observe how carefully all the attendant particulars are phrased to illustrate his denial, and show his dependent and subordinate character; viz., that the Father had sanctified him, had him sent into the world, and, in the next verse, that the works he did were the Father's. I see not how it is possible, in the face of this record, to affirm the Deity of Christ, without compromising his character for integrity, honesty, and truth.

(4.) *The whole tenor and drift of the New Testament is to the point that Christ is inferior to God, who is alone Eternal, Infinite, and Supreme.*

It is a just rule in reading a book where some passages are obscure, or unintelligible, or in seeming contradiction to other passages, to appeal to the general tenor or sense of the whole; and thus seek to get at

[1] Is it not singular that Christians should make the same mistake which the Jews made in regard to this saying of Jesus, "I and my Father are one;" and that they should persist in forcing upon it a meaning which he so positively disavows?

the true import of the doubtful, through the evident intent and meaning of the entire book. In order to illustrate this point, and exhibit the weight of the argument, I shall introduce the following summary of texts:

1st. Those passages in the New Testament, in which the FATHER is styled *one* or *only* GOD, are in number 17.

2d. Those passages where he is styled God *absolutely*, by way of *eminence and supremacy*, are in number 320.

3d. Those passages where he is styled God with *peculiarly high titles and epithets* or *attributes*, are in number 105.

4th. Those passages wherein it is declared that *all prayers and praises* ought to be offered to HIM, and that every thing ought ultimately to be directed to HIS *honor and glory*, are in number 90.

5th. Passages wherein the Son is declared positively, and by the clearest implication, to *be subordinate to the* FATHER, *deriving His being from Him, receiving from Him his divine power, and acting in all things wholly according to the will of the Father*, are in number above 300.

6th. Of 1300 passages in the New Testament, where the word God is mentioned, not one of them necessarily implies a plurality of persons.[1]

Such are the Scriptural grounds on which we re-

[1] Grundy's Lectures, where the passages are quoted in full. In addition to the above may be counted 2,000 passages from the Old Testament, in which the oneness of God is positively asserted, or evidently implied. See also Wilson's Scriptural Proofs of Unitarianism, where the texts are classified according to the thought.

ject the doctrine of the Trinity, and affirm that God is one only; and that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, inferior and subordinate to him, but sanctified, and gifted, and exalted, by him, above all other beings, angels and men; and sent into the world as his Image, the Brightness of his glory, the Representative of his truth and love, the Example, the Sanctifier and Saviour of the world.

SECTION II.

THE ATONEMENT, WHAT IT IS, AND HOW WE ARE RECONCILED AND SAVED BY THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

The word "Atonement" is one of those theological terms, the true meaning of which has been sadly perverted; and the beautiful and tender thought which it expresses in the Scriptures, overlaid with the errors and coarse definitions of the schools and creeds.

It is a curious fact that this word, which occupies so large a space in the theological literature, and sectarian controversies, of our time, is found only once in the New Testament. Rom. v. 11. And the use of it in this passage is so directly in conflict with the meaning commonly attached to it, that it is a marvel how it ever came to signify substitution, or the suffering of Christ in the sense of satisfaction to Divine Justice.

The meaning of the original word is wide enough from this idea, and is properly expressed in every other passage where it occurs, by the English word "reconciliation." And this was the meaning of the

word "atonement" in early English, and at the time the present translation was made. It has passed out of this into its present narrow and perverted sense, since that day. A few references to earlier literature will illustrate this point.

Johnson, the lexicographer, states that the *primitive* meaning of the word was "to *agree*, to *accord*." And he quotes from Shakespeare, who was contemporary with our translators, in proof of this:

> "He and Aufidius can no more atone
> Than violentest contrariety."

Trench, in his Glossary of English Words, gives the following illustrations of its early usage:

"His first essay succeeded so well, Moses would venture on a second design, to *atone* two Israelites at variance."

"Having more regard to their old variance than their new *atonement*."

"If Sir John Falstaff have committed disparagement unto you, I am of the Church, and will be glad to do my benevolence, to make *atonements* and compromises between you."[1]

In all these examples, "atone" signifies *agreement*, or *reconciliation*, being put in opposition to "contrariety," "variance," "hostility," &c. Originally it was written as two words, joined by a hyphen, and pronounced thus, *at-one;* and the noun *at-one-ment*, meaning a state of *oneness* or *unity*.

In the Apocrypha the translators have used the

[1] *Coriolanus*, Act. iv. Sc. 6. Fuller's *Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, ii 92. Moore's *History of Richard III.*, *Merry Wives of Windsor* Act i. Sc. 1.

word in this form: "Then cried they to Simon, beseeching them to be *at-one* with them," referring to those besieged in the tower at Jerusalem. 1 Maccabees xiii. 50. So in the second book of Maccabees, where the wish is expressed that God "would hear your prayers and be *at-one* with you," i. 5. And again it is written: "Though the Lord be angry with us a little while for our chastening and correction, yet shall he be *at-one* again with his servants," vii. 33. And in the New Testament we have this use of the word: "The next day he showed himself unto them as they strove, and would have *set them at-one* again." Acts vii. 26; i. e. would have *atoned* or *reconciled* them.

The Book of Homilies, of the Church of England, employs the term in the same sense in reference to Christ's death, though it falsely applies it to God instead of man.[1] The New Testament never speaks of God being reconciled to man, but it is always man who is reconciled to God. Hence in the passage already named, the only one in which the word atonement is used, we have it in this form: "But we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *we have now received the atonement.*" Rom. v. 11. It is *we* who have been atoned or reconciled to God, not God to us. And this is the uniform witness of the Gospel; and it shows how utterly unfounded is the common doctrine of God's wrath against man, and the necessity of Christ's sacrificial death in order to satisfy his offended justice. Let us see how this stands in the sacred text.

[1] See Noble's Lectures on Important Doctrines, pp. 368–370.

Rom. v. 10, 11. "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life," &c. 2 Cor. v. 18–20. "All things are of God, *who hath reconciled us* to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ *reconciling the world unto himself*, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you, in Christ's stead, *be ye reconciled to God.*" Rom. xi. 15. "The reconciling *of the world.*" 1 Cor. vii. 11. "Let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband."

These are all the passages in the New Testament where the Greek word rendered atonement occurs; and, as we see, in every instance but one it is rendered by the word "reconciliation," in its substantive or verbal form. The idea embodied in the word is obvious enough, and the doctrine is plain and positive beyond mistake or dispute. It is we who are enemies to God, not he an enemy to us. We are the unreconciled party; and the object of Christ's death, and the whole aim and intent of the Gospel, is this one thing — *to reconcile man to God.* This is the true atonement, and this is all that is embodied in the figures of a Sacrifice, a Mediator, Intercessor, Advocate, &c. There is no suffering of punishment in the place of the guilty world; no infliction of the penalties of the violated law on one who never offended; no satisfaction rendered to inexorable justice; no confusion of God the judge and executioner, and God the

victim and sufferer; nothing vicarious or substitutional, in any sense whatever, in this scriptural presentation of the subject.[1] God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, and the burthen of the ministry of reconciliation is simply this—"Be *ye* reconciled to God." Hence the apostle declares that "it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, whether things in earth, or things in heaven." Col. i. 19, 20.

And it is at this point where we see the union of God and Christ in the salvation of man. In the pre-

[1] Those who would see to what extent of blasphemy a creed may go respecting Christ's suffering as our substitute, may consult Luther's comment on Gal. iii. 13. I have not courage to quote it; but it may be found in Noyes' *Introduction* to his "Collection of Theological Essays," a most valuable article. It is instructive to follow the gradual growth of reasonable views on the subject, from Luther's day to the present. Dr. Noyes has shown the way. The following specimen will illustrate one stage of the growth. It is from FLAVEL, whose works are still published by the American Tract Society: "To wrath, to the wrath of an infinite God without mixture, to the very torments of hell, was Christ delivered, and that by the hands of his own Father." "It was wrath aggravated in diverse respects beyond that which the damned themselves do suffer." *Per contra*, those who would see what progress has been made in regard to the doctrine of the atonement, even in the bosom of the Church, may read the Essays by JOWETT on "The Atonement," the "Imputation of the sin of Adam," &c., in his Commentary on Paul's Epistles, or in Noyes's Collection. Rev. CHARLES KINGSLEY, also of the English Church, and one of the most popular authors of the day, himself a Universalist, in his preface to the "Fool of Quality," by Henry Brooke, who was also a Universalist, speaks severely of the creeds which teach that God "will doom to endless torture the vast majority of the human race; while he has made, for the purpose of delivering a very small minority, *a certain highly artificial arrangement* (the atonement,) to be explained by no human notions of justice or of love;" thus making "the divine morality utterly different from the ideal of human morality." p. xlix. London Edit. 1859.

vious chapter, on the divine character and attributes, we showed that the discipline and final redemption of the human race, was embraced in the original plan of God, and that his Power and Wisdom were engaged to overcome all obstacles, to remove all opposition, obstinacy, and evil, from the heart of man, and reconcile and restore him to holiness and heaven. But while this was the original purpose of God, it was also his purpose to accomplish this, not by a miracle, but through appointed means; or, in one word, through the grace and truth of Jesus Christ the Son, aided and blessed by the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. And the declaration of Paul, just cited, indicates the manner in which Christ, as the anointed of God, becomes to man "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," the Mediator, the Reconciler, and Saviour.

And how beautiful and intelligible is all this, and in what a different light it presents the character of God, compared with the popular doctrine of atonement. A world disobedient, sinful, long wandering, and borne down with the sorrows and sufferings that have come of transgression — God a loving and pitying Father, looking upon, and watching over, his wayward children, with a tender and never wearying affection; and sending his willing Son, endued with wisdom and power, to show them the way of repentance and restoration. He comes in the Father's name, and with an earnest and true soul, gives himself to the task of leading the wandering sheep back to the fold of rest and safety. He reveals the true character of God, whom they had feared, and at whose name they had trembled; he tells them of his infinite and unchangeable love; his goodness that has

been so patient, and suffered so long with them; of his compassion for them in their blindness, and error, and sin, and his purposes of grace and redemption, through faith and obedience; of his wise and beneficent laws made for their good, and the reasonableness and blessedness of obedience; of the inheritance of life and immortality, of which they were heirs and joint-heirs with him, and through him! And when he has opened to them these great truths, and shed the light and warmth of them into their hearts, he calls upon the prodigals to be reconciled to God, to receive the *at-one-ment* which he offers them, and come back to the blessed home where all things beautiful abide, and where the soul shall rejoice forevermore in the sunshine of Heaven.

And to this holy work he devotes all his strength and energies. He pleads with them, toils and suffers, and is persecuted even by those whom he seeks to bless—so perverse is the heart of man, so cruel is sin. And at last betrayed and crucified, he seals the sincerity of his words and actions, and crowns his life and labors, with his death.

And that to the *Death of Christ*, as well as to his life, the writers of the New Testament attribute a peculiar influence and efficacy in the work of atonement, cannot be denied. It is associated with the salvation of the world, in such a way as to show that it had a special place among the agencies working out the result. A consideration of this point, a little more in detail, will discover to us the more important relations of the Saviour's death to the atonement, or the reconciliation of man to God.

1. *The death of Christ as an Example.*—Jesus not only came to show us how to live, but also how to die, how to yield up everything to truth and duty, how to die with forgiveness and love toward all men, even our enemies; with faith and resignation toward God; with courage and confidence respecting the future.

Through suffering he was made perfect, as the Captain of our Salvation. His death was the crowning glory of his great work, giving to the whole the harmonious beauty of perfect proportion and completeness. Had he not died and triumphed as he did, we should have felt that something was wanting, that the finish was omitted. We should have been in doubt how he would have met the last great trial. But now we know how he met it, and that his death was like his life, serene and beautiful, an exhibition of highest love, a perfect submission to the will of God, a complete surrender of self to the good of mankind, amid fearful agonies, and girded about with unmitigated horrors and ferocities.

His death shows us how to conquer, how to forgive, how to be true to highest principle; and so as an example of the divinest sort, helps, by its direct influence on the heart, to save from hate, and passion, and human weakness, and the power of evil. And finally, it helps *us* to meet death, even in its worst forms, and amid its fiercest terrors, with composure, and sweetness, and holy trust toward God.

And what power there is in this example, may be seen in the case of *Stephen*, when, bruised and crushed with the stones dashed upon him by his murderers, he knelt down, and cried with a loud voice,

"Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." The death of Jesus, and his great prayer, "Father, forgive them," had taught him how to die, and how to forgive his bloody-minded assassins.

And on how many hearts has the perfected example of Christ, in his death, had a subduing, sanctifying, and redeeming power. How many have offered up the prayer of forgiveness, who never would have done it but for his death scene. How many have thus received the atonement, and been reconciled to God and their fellows, through the sacrifice of the Lamb of God.

2. *The death of Christ is a commendation of God's love to the world.*—In this respect, the death of the Saviour is peculiar in character, and in its direct relation to the reconciliation and redemption of man. The Scriptures of the New Testament constantly present it in this light, as being designed especially to reveal and commend the love of God to man. The death of no other servant of God, of no other good man, is ever spoken of in this respect, as the death of Jesus is. Others may die as martyrs, as friends of humanity, in behalf of the truth; but in no instance is their death said to stand in that peculiar position between God and mankind, which is uniformly assigned to the death of Christ. In no case is it said of them, that they died to commend the love of God to the world; or that their death was intended to bear a direct and efficacious relation to the salvation of man.

If it be asked why the death of Christ is any more an exhibition of divine love, than the death of any good man in the same cause; it can only be answer-

ed by the fact that God must, in some way, reveal himself, and make known his love to his erring and sinful children. Some means must be employed, some visible and actual exhibition of his gracious mercy must be made; and all we can say is, that, amid an infinite variety of methods, he chose this, the death of Christ.

Of the fact itself, that he did choose this method, that the death of Christ was a commendation of his favor and love, we have plainest declaration. In his Epistle to the Romans, Paul expressly states that "God commendeth *his love toward us*, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Chap. v. 8. So John: "For God *so loved the world* that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." John iii. 16, 17. So in his first Epistle: "In this was manifested *the love of God toward us*, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." Chap. iv. 9.

All this shows that Christ died, not because God was angry with us, not to save the world from the divine wrath and vengeance; but because God loved the world, and sought to deliver it, through Christ, from sin and death, and every power of evil. He sends his only Son, as his representative, to die in attestation of the greatness of his affection toward us. He shows us, in the sufferings and death of Christ, how strongly he is bound to us, how mighty is the love which, amid so much evil and wickedness, still

clings to the guilty, and seeks their good, and aims to deliver them into the glorious liberty of his spiritual children.

How this exhibition of Divine Love in the death of Christ, how the crucifixion scene itself, influences the hardest heart, and with a mighty moral power, overcomes the evil in it, and inspires it with gratitude, love, and goodness; and how, therefore, the death of the Saviour is related to the salvation of the sinner, is sufficiently plain without argument. When he sees the great love of God, as manifested in the death of Jesus, when he sees that the very heart he has pierced, beats in its last pulses of agony with tenderest affection for him; in spite of himself the rebellious spirit within him is subdued into shame and penitence; the ice of sin melts away before the warmth of Divine Love; and now he feels how hard it is to sin against such love. And at last, contemplating this pathetic scene, this exhibition of goodness and compassion, he is forced to yield, and cries out with Saul, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" And so in his case the *atonement* is complete; he is reconciled to God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

3. *The death of Christ, associated with his Resurrection, confirms the assurance of our future existence, and delivers us from the fear of death.*

This is declared to be one of the great purposes of the death of Christ, that he might rise again to the justification of our hope of immortality; and show us that we also shall live again, and, being children of the resurrection, shall therefore, on that account, be also children of God. To this end, the Saviour

directs attention to this point, often speaking of his death and his triumph over the grave, fixing the thought of his disciples and hearers on the predicted event, that when it came to pass, they might remember his words.

It was the purpose of God that it should take place under peculiar circumstances, with special accompaniments, that it might be known and perceived in its relations to the future life of the soul; and furnish a foundation of hope and faith, that, as our Redeemer liveth, we shall live also. It is made to occupy a prominent place in the history and mission of the Saviour, that the attention of the world might be drawn to it as a demonstration of the truth of what he had taught on this point.

Thus it reveals to us the plan of God respecting our hereafter, and reconciles us to him by faith and gratitude, making us *at-one* with him. Thus, also, it contributes to our salvation from doubt and fear respecting death; and establishes on a rock foundation, our confidence in that great and blessed truth, which, before Christ, had either not been seen at all, or so dimly seen, that it neither softened the terrors of death, nor lifted the impenetrable gloom of the grave; so dimly that it imparted to the dying neither courage nor consolation. But now, if Christ died and rose again as a prophecy of our future life, the problem is solved, the darkness and gloom are scattered, and light from his empty tomb, glorious and beautiful, streams downward into the valley of shadows, and upward to the gates of heaven. We are reconciled to God; we are reconciled to death. We see how "through death he destroys him that had the

power of death, that is, the devil; and delivers those who, through fear of death, were all their life time subject to bondage." Heb. ii. 14, 15.

Thus it is that Christ's death is related, in a peculiar and efficacious manner, to our salvation in the gospel sense, i. e. salvation from sin and disobedience, from the bondage and the fear of death, and from evil of every sort. And we see how it is, that through the blood of Christ we have forgiveness or remission of sins, are spiritually washed and made clean, and accepted of God; or, in Paul's words, how by him we receive the atonement, and have peace with God. We see, in clearest light, and understand, the meaning of the atonement, that is, reconciliation to God. It is plain to us that, though Christ does not, as our substitute, save us from punishment by suffering for us, yet he saves us from sin, by leading us away from it into the paths of life and peace.

Let us consider how immense the sacrifice, in order for us to die to save a righteous man, or *a dear friend even*, from death. But the love of God for us is manifest in that, while we were yet *sinners and enemies*, Christ died for us! Let us contemplate the death of the Saviour in this light, and we shall soon discover how it is that we are saved by his death — we shall soon find its spiritual power over our wayward affections and passions. As we feel the warm blood trickling down upon our hearts from his wounded side, his lacerated hands and feet, and hear his prayer of forgiveness, we shall be completely conquered by the divine and heavenly influence. The spirit will bow in grateful penitence to the power of Almighty Love; and every evil affection will die out

from the heart. And thus, receiving the atonement, and saved with an everlasting salvation, we shall gladly join the throng who take up the song of the Redeemed: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." Rev. i. 5.

SECTION III.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST NOT VICARIOUS — HE DID NOT SUFFER AS OUR SUBSTITUTE — ARGUMENT FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

It may be said that the foregoing presentation of the doctrine of Atonement, differs in a very marked manner from the popular views on this subject; and that there are some passages of scripture which seem not only not to accord with this theory, but to declare the death of Christ to be sacrificial in the ordinary sense of the word, especially portions of the Epistle to the Hebrews. This presumed difficulty is now entitled to a respectful consideration.

So far as the Epistle to the Hebrews is concerned, the sum of the matter is, that the apostle makes a general comparison, showing a general resemblance between the things of the law and of the gospel; with a view, at the same time, to show the differences in important particulars between the two, and wherein, in respect to these differences, Christ and the gospel are superior to Aaron and the Law. And it is only in the light of this fact, keeping the design of the writer in the foreground, that any one can hope

to understand the language and teachings of this epistle.

And at the very outset, the idea of substitution is disavowed, in the positive declaration that, under the Law Dispensation ("the word spoken by angels,") "every transgression and disobedience *received* a just recompense of reward," ii. 2; i. e. says Hammond, "the breaches of the law were actually punished." Now, if this be true, then plainly the sacrifices of the law were not vicarious. If *every* transgression and disobedience *received* a just punishment, then the sin and trespass offerings of the Law did not save from this punishment. They were not something accepted as a substitute for this, and thereby wholly releasing the sinner from the consequences of his sin. Nothing, it would seem, can be plainer than this, or more conclusive against the vicarious theory.

And the same is apparent now. Notwithstanding the asserted vicarious death of Christ, men suffer for their sins as much as if no satisfaction had been rendered to the divine law. Every trangression and disobedience receives its just recompense and reward under the new, as well as under the old, dispensation; and the sacrifice of Christ does not seem to interfere with the natural operation of the moral and physical law, any more than the Levitical sacrifices.

There is no transfer of the guilty conscience, the remorse and terror of the murderer, to the innocent sufferer on the cross. The crime and its punishment still cling together in the darkened and condemned soul of the criminal. And it cannot be otherwise as man is constituted at present. Vicarious suffering for sin, the transfer of the proper and only legitimate

punishment of sin, from the guilty to the innocent, is a simple impossibility, without an entire change of man's moral and spiritual nature, which would be substantially the creation of a new race of beings.

And the physical suffering, broken constitution, wasted property, degradation, shame, and wretchedness of soul and body, which reveal the drunkard, reveal also that the punishment is inherent in, and inseparable from, the sin, and that no sacrifice can save from it. Nay, they show that, without a perpetual miracle, without the constant interposition of God in every example of transgression, the punishment of sin could not in any sense be transferred to Christ. [1]

I turn now to the consideration of some of the particulars respecting the sacrifice of Christ, as they are set forth in this epistle and in other scriptures.

§ I. *Christ a Sacrifice for Sin.*—The constant declaration is, that Christ offered himself a sacrifice for sin, and not as a substitute to release man from punishment. "His blood cleanseth from all sin;" he "puts away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" "he offered one sacrifice for sins for ever;" he "bears the sins of many;" our "hearts are sprinkled from an evil conscience;" we are "purged from dead works to serve the living God," &c.

[1] Dr. CLARKE justly says, "Every sinner has a *daily pay*, and this pay is *death*; he has *misery* because he sins. Sin constitutes hell; the sinner has a hell in his own bosom; all is *confusion* and *disorder* where God does not reign; every indulgence of sinful passions increases the disorder, and consequently the misery of the sinner." *Note on Rom.* vi. 23. This being the case, it is not easy to see how Christ suffers in his stead, unless the sinner receives double wages, or is paid twice, — once in his own person and once in the person of Christ.

This is the language of the epistle perpetually repeated, but not a word of his bearing the *punishment* of sin, or suffering as a substitute in this respect. And thus the epistle harmonizes with the rest of the New Testament, which uniformly testifies that he saves us from sin and iniquity. "He gave himself for our sins," that he might "redeem us from all *iniquity;*" "he shall be called Jesus, for he shall save his people from their *sins*," &c.

And it is at this point that Paul establishes one evidence of the superiority of Christ's sacrifice over those of the Law. The last could not save from the power of sin, nor establish the heart in holiness. They were only acknowledgments of the righteousness of God's rule, and of the offence and regret of the transgressor; but they supplied no spiritual life or energy. "The bringing in of a better hope" did; the love of God displayed in the death of Christ, quickened and renewed, and sanctified the sinful and disobedient. "For in this was the love of God manifested, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." It is this that makes the sacrifice of Christ so efficacious in subduing the sinful heart; and it gives point to the exclamation, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." The hardest heart often yields to love and goodness, when the most vigorous, and even righteous, law fails to make any impression on it.

§ II. *Christ our Passover.*—The last quotation, which speaks of the Saviour as the "Lamb of God," leads naturally to the Jewish Passover, which is regarded as a special type of Christ.

Paul says to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 7,) "For

even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." But any one can see that it is only in an accommodated sense that this is said; and even if it were to be understood as a full and true type, it would prove nothing for the vicarious theory.

The Passover began in Egypt, before the giving of the law, and was perpetuated as one of the festivals under the law. The record is in Exodus xii. 1–28. Here the Israelites are required to kill a lamb, and eat it with unleavened bread, and to "take of the blood and strike it on the two side-posts, and on the upper door-post," of their houses. "For the Lord will pass through and smite the (first born of the) Egyptians, and when he seeth the blood upon the lintel, and on the two side-posts, the Lord will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you." Verse 23.

Now there is nothing like a sacrifice of substitution here, nor even an offering for sin. The Jews had not sinned, were in no danger of punishment, and the lamb was not intended to avert the wrath of God against them. The judgment was against the Egyptians entirely, and the blood on the door-posts was a token of deliverance for them and theirs, from the destroying angel. And in this sense Christ is our Passover, if his blood is so appropriated, through faith and obedience, as to distinguish us, as true Israelites, from the hardened and wicked Egyptians. If "the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin," then we are known as his, and the angel of judgment passes us over. We are saved from those evils which we should have suffered had we continued in sin, as did the Egyptians. Hence Christ is called the

"Lamb (i. e., of the Passover,) that taketh away the sin of the world."

§ III. *Christ our Ransom.*—The Scriptures speak of Christ as a ransom. He says himself, "The Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. xx. 28. Paul affirms that "he gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time." 1 Tim. ii. 6.

The thought embodied in this form of expression is plainly, deliverance from the bondage of sin. The prophet Isaiah represents the arm of the Lord as that which "made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over." li. 10. The ransomed here were the Israelites, ransomed or delivered from the servitude of Egypt. Of course, the Lord did not pay a price to the Egyptians to let his people go, though they are said to be ransomed. See also Jer. xxxi. 11. So in Hosea xiii. 14, God says, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death." Now, are we to suppose that God really, literally, or in any sense, paid a price to the grave in order to release those referred to from its power! Did he redeem them in the sense of buying them out of the hands of death? Did he render to death, or the grave, an equivalent for the life of those who were ransomed? No; but the manner in which they were ransomed, is shown in the next words: "O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction!"

So Jesus is represented as giving himself to ransom or redeem mankind from the servitude and slavery of sin. He strengthens the heart in its resistance, he inspires it with heavenly courage, he breaks the

power of evil, and the bonds of iniquity, and leads us forth into spiritual liberty. In a word, he destroys sin, makes an end of it, and so liberates us from its bondage, and establishes the law of righteousness in all hearts forevermore.

§ IV. *Christ redeems us from the curse of the Law.* Though the passage here referred to is in Galatians, it properly comes in here for notice. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Gal. iii. 13. It is easy to see that this was a kind of proverb, or popular saying among the Jews; because there is no possible reason, in the nature of things, why one who was hanged on a tree, should be specially cursed of God, more than one put to death in any other way. The apostle's reference is to Deut. xxi. 23, where the body of one executed in this way, is ordered to be taken down and buried before night, that the land be not defiled by its presence.

Because Jesus was crucified, or hanged on a tree, the apostle applies this popular saying to him, as expressive of what he suffered, in order to redeem the world. The law of which Paul speaks, is the law of the Mosaic rites and ceremonies, the burden, the yoke or curse which Peter witnessed to in the Council at Jerusalem: "Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the disciples (Gentiles,) which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Acts xv. Christ delivers us from this, and abolishes it altogether, by his death, and in this sense may be said to be "made a curse for us."

Of course, the curse of the law was not endless

punishment, for that Christ did not suffer; and it is nowhere revealed in the law of Moses as the penalty of transgression; nor is it alluded to in any way. This is agreed to on all hands by the most learned of Biblical scholars, such as Paley, Whately, Jahn, Mayer, Wines, Warburton, &c., the last of whom says, "In the writings of Moses, we find *nothing but temporal rewards and punishments.*"[1] If the thing was not known to Moses, it could not be the curse of his law on him who was hanged upon a tree. As remarked, it was a current proverb among the Jewish people, and the apostle simply applies it to Christ, by whose death on the cross, or tree, the law and its burthensome ritual were abolished, and the reign of grace and love set up in the hearts of men.

§ V. *Christ bearing our griefs, and wounded for our transgressions.*—The language of Isaiah liii. 4–6, 10, compared with 1 Peter ii. 21–24. "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all."

This is as strong language as can be cited from the Scriptures, and yet a moment's examination will show the impossibility of a literal interpretation. How could Christ bear the grief, or carry the sorrow of sin, who knew no sin? It is not possible he could feel the remorse of the criminal, the murderer; or the ag-

[1] See this subject illustrated in the "Origin and History of the Doctrine of Endless Punishment," by the author. The argument shows the false use made of this passage from Galatians by believers in the vicarious sufferings of Christ.

ony of shame and degradation, and the physical torment, of the drunkard.

But in a figurative sense he may be said to bear our griefs and sorrows, as John Howard bore the griefs and sorrows of the prisoners and the wretched whom he visited and comforted, and, by incessant toil and effort, relieved from the cruelties laid upon them.

So Christ bears our sorrows and "our sins in his own person on the tree," by living, and laboring, and dying, to deliver us from them. And thus we are healed by his stripes, our peace is secured by his suffering, we are redeemed from sin by the power of truth and grace revealed in his death. Hence he says, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." John xii. 32.[1]

Matt. viii. 16, 17, is a perfect commentary on Isaiah and Peter. "And he cast out the spirits with his word, and he healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses."

Now, in what sense did, or could, Jesus take the infirmities of those who were diseased, or bear their sicknesses? What did he do in their case? We are told in the preceding words: "He *healed* all that

[1] These words of Jesus are beautifully paraphrased by ELIZABETH BARRET BROWNING, in the "Drama of Exile," in which she discovers her own faith in the great redemption:

"Look on me!
As I shall be uplifted on a cross
In darkness of eclipse, and anguish dread!
So shall I lift up in my pierced hands—
Not into dark, but light: not unto death,
But life — *beyond the reach of guilt and grief*,
THE WHOLE CREATION."

were sick." This is the equivalent of the phrase, "he bare our sicknesses;" which, in a physical sense, is the equivalent of the phrase, "he bare our sins," in a moral sense. Christ bore the infirmities and sicknesses of the people by healing them; and he bears our sins in the same way, by restoring us to spiritual health.[1]

Both prophet and apostle undoubtedly had the scapegoat of the great day of atonement in mind, and borrowed the phraseology of that custom, as recorded in Levit. xvi. 20–22. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited — and he shall let the goat go in the wilderness."

Of course, all this is tropical, and not literal. Literally it is impossible. The thing is done only in a figure; for in no other possible sense could the legal or moral sins of the people be laid upon the head of the goat, or he be made to bear them, or carry them away into the wilderness. And even in this figure, it is to be observed that it is not the punishment, but the iniquity and sin of the people, which the goat is represented as bearing. There is nothing vicarious in the transaction.

The sum of the matter is, that the scapegoat was a

[1] While writing this, a friend, speaking of a distinguished physician, remarked, "He *carried* my mother through a severe sickness." He carried her in the sense of curing her.

symbolic expression, on the part of the people, of their purpose to put away all the sins and iniquities of the past; and, on the part of God, of his acceptance of this evidence of their repentance, and his willingness to blot out the past, and to begin a new account with them, and to receive them as though they had not sinned at all.

But the renewal of this sacrifice and ceremony every year, shows, as the apostle says, how ineffectual it was in putting away sin, or the disposition to it. There was no moral power in the form,—nothing that could affect or win the heart. The live goat led into the wilderness could no more take away sin, than the blood of the slain goat. They were simply an acknowledgment of the righteousness of the law, and of the obligation to obey it.

And here, again, the argument of the Epistle takes effect, and, by contrast, shows the superiority of Christ's sacrifice. He removes, puts away sin by the sacrifice of himself, and does it effectually, — not by exhibiting the sternness of the lawgiver, or the unyielding rigor of the law, but by displaying the infinite and everlasting love of the Father. And this is not for one people only, but for the whole world. He is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Not in part, but entirely; for "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." Not for a year only, but for all time; for "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, he for ever sat down on the right hand of God;" and "we are sanctified once for all, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ."

So greatly superior is the sacrifice and atonement

of our great High Priest and Saviour; and so marked are the special differences, notwithstanding the general resemblance, between the priesthood of Aaron and that of Jesus.

And to the glorious result set forth in this Epistle, all Scripture points. The prophet declares it in the very passage which represents him as bearing our iniquities; for, says the man of God, "he shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied, the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand."

And what is this *pleasure* of the Lord which shall prosper in his hand? Answer: "It *pleased* the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself." Col. i.

Thus the pleasure and the purpose of the Lord, the sacrifice and atonement, the travail, desire and satisfaction of Christ, and the deliverance of all souls from sin, unite on one point; and shed the splendors of the celestial world on the love of God to man, as displayed in the perfected plan of universal holiness and happiness.

Having thus, by aid of the Scriptures, obtained a correct understanding of the character and office of Christ, the meaning and purpose of his death and atonement, and his relation to Man as a Saviour; the next step in our inquiry is to ascertain the nature and moral status of man, the being who is to be saved, and to discover the causes of his sinful condition, and the reasons for his need of a Saviour.

This becomes necessary in order to understand the exact moral relation existing between God as Creator and Man as the creature; as well as for the purpose of exhibiting the true relation of Christ as the Redeemer, to Man as the redeemed. We wish to know the organic condition of man, his spiritual structure, at the time he comes from the forming hand of his Maker; and to ascertain through what agency he has fallen from innocence into a condition requiring the help of a Saviour; and what this condition is into which he has fallen, its effect upon his nature or character. All this we must know that we may be able to form a clear idea of what it is the Saviour does for man, what the nature of the salvation he works out for him, and the precise character of the evil or evils from which he saves him.

And thus we shall discover how the creative work of God, in its moral aspects, connects, through Christ the Saviour, with the moral nature of man, and his present sinful condition; and how these, in turn, connect with the renewing work of the Holy Spirit, and the great Redemption of the Gospel.

CHAPTER III.

MAN—THE RECTITUDE OF HIS NATURE—ORIGINAL SIN—NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

SECTION I.

THE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE AND THE EARLY CHURCH RESPECTING MAN'S MORAL ABILITY.

It cannot but be evident to every careful reader, that the Old and New Testaments are based, from first to last, on the ability of man to obey the law of God, on the presumption that he has the power to be good in word, thought, and deed. All the exhortations and warnings, all the counsels, commands, and encouragements, all the rewards and punishments of the old dispensation and of the new, of the Law and the Gospel, proceed upon the ground that mankind are equally capable of good and evil, of holiness and wickedness. There is no meaning in these things, but upon this supposition. If it be not so, the whole Bible is an enigma, without moral force or authority; for where there is no power to obey, there is no authority in the law. If the moral precepts of Christianity were addressed to the beasts of the field, or the fowls of the air, they would have no moral weight, nor would these creatures be under any obligations to obey. Where there is no moral sense,

there can be no moral obligation. If, therefore, the commandments and precepts, if the promises and threatenings, of the Bible have any authority, force or meaning to them, and we are under the slightest obligation to obey, we are so far capable of obeying. Our moral responsibility goes precisely to the extent of our moral ability.

But suppose, as is so largely believed and taught in Christian churches, that we are born into the world depraved, with a corrupt and perverted nature inherited from Adam; that we are created by God "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil." Suppose this were so, why does God require us to be good, and do good? Does he expect a corrupt tree to bring forth good fruit? Does he insist on gathering grapes of thorns, and figs of thistles?

And why has he given us the Bible? Why has he given us a moral law? What reason or justice is there in such commands as these—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all the heart, and soul, and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself; If thine enemy hunger, feed him, if he thirst, give him drink; Recompense no man evil for evil, but overcome evil with good; Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, be put away from you, with all malice; Abstain from all fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; Cleanse yourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, for as he that hath called you is holy, so be ye holy, perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect, Abstain from all appearance of evil."

Is it possible for any intelligent Christian, in the face of these and a thousand other like exhortations

and commands, to believe that mankind are by nature totally depraved, and wholly incapable of good in deed, or thought, or feeling? Is it likely that the God who commands these virtues, has made it impossible for us, of ourselves, ever to attain to them? That he has suffered us to come into the world inheriting from Adam a nature "prone to all evil, full of all wickedness," and then bidden us, under the threat of endless torment, to be holy as he is holy, perfect as he is perfect? Is it possible for any sincere and pious believer in the Christian Scriptures, so shockingly to defame the justice and goodness of our Father in Heaven? Is it not much more reasonable to suppose, since he has exhorted and commanded us to be good, that we *can* be good of ourselves; and that if we are evil, it is because we choose it, and not because we have "wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good?"

Take this example: "What doth the Lord require of thee, O man, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." On reading this, is it not the first thought and conviction with every man, that he can do it? that, if he will make the effort, he has the moral ability to obey this requirement? And does not every one who reads this, instinctively feel that the very fact that God has given us this commandment, is proof conclusive that we have the power to conform to it? Truly, as we have said, the whole Bible is a complete riddle, an insolvable problem, if the doctrines of original sin, and hereditary total depravity, be true.

The plain doctrine of the Scriptures, direct and inferential, is that of the entire rectitude of human

nature. Every mortal brought into existence, is placed on the same moral level with Adam and Eve, equally innocent and pure, hindered in no thing more than they were, having the same moral qualities and unimpaired faculties, the same ability to reject evil and choose good, that they had. Whatever differences exist between individuals, are always relative to the demands made on them. If God has given only one talent, he does not ask five in return. He expects only in the ratio of his original gifts. He holds us to a just improvement of our talents, and to strict obedience to our moral sense; and if we fail in this, he inflicts the deserved punishment—but he does not hold us responsible for the failure of Adam, or punish us for a sin committed thousands of years before we were born.

The man of to-day is created as pure as the first man, but also, as he was, liable to sin. He commences his career as Adam did, without knowledge or experience, without positive character of any sort; for character is the product of action. He has wants and desires, and is subject to strong necessities and temptations; and, being ignorant, he is easily deceived, and under the blind impulse of passion, goes wrong, misjudges his interests, mistakes the means of happiness, and transgresses the law of God. But he is free to choose good or evil; and he is capable of goodness, virtue, and obedience, by nature, of his own free will. And this was the uniform teaching of the primitive church. The dogma of *human inability* was unknown to the Christians of the first four centuries. Let us hear some of the witnesses on this point:

1. *Ignatius*, a contemporary of the Apostles, says: —"I do not speak of two natures of men, but that the one man is sometimes of God, sometimes of the Devil. If one be pious, he is a man of God; but if any man be impious, he is a man of the Devil, being made so, not *by nature*, but *by his own will*."

2. *Justin Martyr*, A. D. 140:—"For this is the nature of every one that is born, *to be capable of virtue and vice;* for nothing would be deserving of praise if it had not the power of *turning itself either way*."

3. *Tatian*, A. D. 172, says:—"*Free will* destroyed us. Being free we became slaves; we were sold because of sin. No evil proceeds from God. We have produced wickedness; but those who have produced it *have it in their power again to renounce it*."

4. *Clement of Alexandria*, A. D. 194:—"His will is that we should be saved *by ourselves*. This, then, is the nature of the soul, *to move by itself*. Then we, who are rational, philosophy itself being rational, have some relation to it. Fitness, indeed, is a tendency to virtue, but it is not virtue. *All* men, then, as I said, are qualified *by nature* for the acquisition of virtue."

5. *Tertullian*, A. D. 200:—"Therefore, though we have learned from the commands of God both what he wills and what he forbids, yet *we have a will and power to choose either*, as it is written, 'Behold, I have set before you good and evil;' for you have tasted of the tree of knowledge. Therefore, that which is subject to our own will, we ought not to refer to the will of God: he who wills no evil, wills that we have a will."

6. *Origen*, A. D. 230, was a strong defender of the freedom of the will. "This also is settled in the doctrine of the Church," says he, that "*every rational soul has free will.*"

7. *Eusebius*, A. D. 315:—"The fault is in him who chooses, not in God. For *God has not made nature or the substance of the soul bad;* for he who is good can make nothing but what is good. *Every thing is good which is according to nature.* Every rational soul *has naturally a good free will*, formed for the choice of that which is good."

8. *Athanasius*, A. D. 326:—"For the knowledge and accurate comprehension of the way of truth, *we have need of nothing but ourselves.* Not as God is above all things, so is the way which leads to these things remote or extraneous to ourselves, but it is *in ourselves.*"[1]

SECTION II.

SPECIAL PROOFS OF THE RECTITUDE OF HUMAN NATURE.

A few direct testimonies under this head will illustrate the correctness of the preceding argument, and show that the Bible, the primitive Church, and Human Nature, are at one on this point.

§ I. *The argument of Ezekiel xviii.*, is a complete refutation of the dogma of original sin and inherited depravity, as well as that of total depravity. "If a

[1] BURNAP'S "Rectitude of Human Nature," pp. 309–314; Neander's History, vols. i. & ii. Tertullian and others believed in depravity inherited from Adam, what they called a "*second nature*, which has its own God and Father, even the author of the corruption himself; but goodness still resides in the soul, that original, god-like and genuine thing, *which is its own proper nature.*" *De Anima*, cap. 41. Neander, vol. ii. pp. 550–561. This is a very different thing from being utterly incapable of goodness

man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, saith the Lord God." But how can he be just, or do what is lawful and right, if by nature he is "wholly inclined to all evil," and has "a corrupted nature conveyed from our first parents, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good?"

Again, speaking of the wicked and violent man, we are told that "if he beget a son that seeth his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like; he shall not die for the iniquity of his father — he shall surely live. . . . . The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon *him*, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon *him*."

How utterly this repudiates the imputation of Adam's sin, and the transmission of his corrupt nature, to all his posterity, both the guilt and the punishment of it. How sharp the contrast between this teaching of the Spirit of God, and what follows from the Institutes of Calvin:—"We all, therefore, who spring from a corrupt seed, are born infected with the contagion of sin; nay, before we behold the light of life, we are, in the sight of God, polluted and defiled;" and "*in the person of one man are given over to eternal death.*"

With this comparison of Bible and creed, we can well understand the apostle's meaning, when he says "the wisdom from above is pure, peaceable, full of mercy, and without partiality," while that from beneath is "earthly, sensual, and devilish."

§ II. *The argument of Paul in Romans ii.*, is to

the same point: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, *do by nature* the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; *which show the work of the law written in their hearts*, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing, one another."

Now, how could these Gentiles do *by nature*, the things in the law, if by nature they were totally depraved, and wholly inclined to all evil? How could they "show the work of the law written in their hearts," if they were "altogether defiled, blind in spirit, and corrupt in heart?" Manifestly either Paul is wrong, or the creed is wrong; and the intelligent Christian will readily decide between them, and accept the scriptural doctrine of the original rectitude of human nature, whether in Jew or Gentile.

§ III. *Christ and little Children.*—"And Jesus called a little child, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be *converted*, and *become as little children*, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of God." "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."

Now, can we imagine an argument more conclusive against the doctrine that we are born into the world corrupt and defiled because of Adam's sin, than this language of the Saviour? If children come into life depraved, and utterly vile, "full of all wickedness, and hatred of God," would Jesus make them the symbols of the innocence and purity of heaven?

Let us put by the side of these sayings of Jesus, another utterance of John Calvin: "And so infants themselves as they bring their damnation with them from their mother's womb, are bound, not by the sin of another, but their own. For although they have not yet produced the fruits of iniquity, they have the seed of it enclosed within them; nay, *their whole nature is*, as it were, *a seed of sin*, so that it cannot but be odious and abominable in the sight of God!"[1]

And yet Jesus says, "Of such is the kingdom of God," and tells us that their angels do always behold the face of the Father. Yea, he even says that except we become like these little children in spirit and character, we cannot enter his kingdom, we cannot become his disciples. Does this look as if their whole nature was a seed of sin? Does it look as if Jesus believed in natural depravity?

But again, he says we must be *converted* in order to become like little children. Do we, by conversion, become wholly corrupt; or do we become pure, and good, and lovable? Does not the language demonstrate the natural purity and innocence of the child nature? Beside, if children are by nature de-

[1] *Calvin's Institutes*, London edition, vol. i. B. ii. p. 198. The French Confession says, that "these little ones, while yet they lie hid and unborn, are deserving of eternal death before God." Beecher's *Conflict of Ages*.

Calvin and his early followers were right in this; and their teaching ought to be respected by all sincere believers in total or natural depravity. If we are born depraved, and there is no change after death, then children dying in infancy must be lost; and so "infant damnation" becomes the logical sequence of natural depravity. Calvin, with a sublimely savage indifference to consequences, pushed his logic to this conclusion — but that was two hundred years ago.

praved, and we, and all the world are so, as the doctrine asserts, how can we *become* like them in character? We are like them now, depraved, and no change can make us more so.

How plain is it, then, that the beautiful sayings of Jesus to his disciples, and to the mothers of Judea, forever exclude from the Christian creed, the monstrous doctrines of inherited corruption, original sin, total depravity, and the whole horrid brood to which they have given birth.

Now we maintain that these testimonies, which are only drops from the sea of texts with which we might flood the subject, set the doctrine of the natural corruption of human nature in direct conflict with the plain and positive teachings of the Bible. We insist that the whole drift of Scripture, the entire sweep of its doctrines and precepts, go to this point; that man is naturally good, that he is morally capable of doing good, obeying the law, loving his fellows, pleasing God, and keeping his heart turned toward heaven.

Of course, he is not held up by a constant miracle. He is capable of doing wrong as well as right. He is, therefore, liable to sin. He may, and does, pervert and abuse his powers; and, instead of growing up morally straight, and tall, and fair, and well-proportioned, he is often warped, and distorted, and gnarled, like a tree diseased or obstructed in its growth. Conversion, or regeneration, acts on the man in this condition much as pruning or dressing acts on the tree; lopping off the twisted limbs and the withered branches, removing all excrescences, cutting out all the diseased parts, clearing away every obstruction; and thus leaving it to return to the

primeval symmetry, the fair proportions, the abundant fruitage—the elements and germs of which were hidden in the original structure.

§ IV. *The argument from conscience and universal consciousness.*—The statement of the apostle regarding the accusing conscience of the Gentiles, the expressions "an evil conscience," "a conscience defiled," "conscience seared with a hot iron," "convicted by their own conscience," all go to show that the unregenerate have a conscience. Now, it is universally admitted that the conscience is that faculty which judges of actions, approving what it thinks good, and condemning those which it believes to be evil. But if human nature is totally depraved, there is no such thing as conscience, no such faculty of the soul as that which distinguishes between good and evil. There is no good to one who is wholly evil. He does not know, of himself, what the word means, nor the thing the word represents; any more than a man totally blind, knows of himself what light is.

So he does not know what evil is, as evil. He has no moral perception, or sense, by which to determine the quality of action; and it is absurd to talk of defiling his conscience, or searing it, or of his being convicted by it.

If we were totally depraved, we should have no convictions of conscience, no regrets for wrong, no remorse for the greatest crimes. Sin would be our native element, in which alone we should find rest and peace; while goodness and virtue would be as offensive to the soul, as foul air is to the lungs. The very fact, therefore, that wrong doing troubles the conscience, that sin and wickedness make us un-

happy, bring us pain and anguish, is decisive proof of the natural rectitude of human nature, and a fitting commentary on the Bible declaration, that "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." Ecc. vii. 29.

Then again, the universal consciousness of mankind, bears witness against the assertion that man is totally corrupt. Every man feels and knows that, by nature, he is capable of virtuous, generous, and just action; and, on the other hand, instinctively trusts in the natural goodness of those around him. And not without reason, for the mass of men *are* good — not saints to be sure, nor are they devils — but good, kind, friendly, honest, just, and charitable. On the other hand, the criminals are few; the proportion they bear to the entire population, is small at the largest.

And great crimes, examples of fiendish cruelty and ferocity, are exceedingly rare; and hence the astonishment and horror they create. If they were as common as they should be on the hypothesis of total depravity, we should become familiar with them, and they would excite no wonder; and all men, being of the same spirit, would rejoice in them. And this is precisely the state of things demanded by the dogma in review—not that a few, but that the whole community should be engaged, not occasionally, but perpetually, in all manner of evil, evil in its worst forms.

But, instead of this, as remarked, the multitude are well disposed, inclined to goodness, kind of heart, ready to render relief, to help the needy, and to comfort the distressed. The crowd rushing to the aid of the sufferers by fire or explosion, the rough

sailor who flings himself into the sea to rescue one whom he never saw before, the little girl sobbing over her wounded kitten or canary, the brave boy who gives up his sled to a young beggar for a coast, woman watching at the sick bed of a stranger, or hurrying through a storm of shot and shell to bring water to the wounded among her enemies, to the destroyers of her home — every one of these is a witness to the natural, innate goodness, of the human heart. And the universal admiration which such actions command, the conscious feeling of all men that they are beautiful and heavenly, are so many additional proofs that, notwithstanding the sin of Adam, the divine nature still lingers in the soul of man.

SECTION III.

CRITICISM OF TEXTS CITED IN PROOF OF NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

There are a few passages which may seem to require a brief notice before dismissing the subject of this chapter. But if no satisfactory explanation could be given, it would be wiser to conclude that we do not understand them, and wait for farther light, than to interpret them in a way to conflict with the general teaching and spirit of the Bible.

(1.) "*The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.*" Ps. lviii. 3. It is easy to see that this is only a bold form of speech, a strong hyperbole, for describing the great wickedness of the lying enemies to whom David is supposed to allude in this Psalm. Of course, it cannot be taken as literal fact, for babes cannot go astray *as soon* as they are born,

since at that time they have neither mental nor moral character; or, as God himself said of the children of Nineveh, "cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand." Jonah iv. 11. Beside, this is not said of all mankind, but only of those called specially "the wicked."

(2.) "*Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.*" Ps. li. 5. This is of the same kind of superlative hyperbole with the preceding, expressive of David's conviction of exceeding sinfulness. It is the only example of such language in the Bible, and it is not at all likely that such a doctrine as that of inherited corruption, involving such tremendous consequences, would be left to rest upon the doubtful phraseology of a single text. The Psalmist never talks about original sin; but his lamentations are all in regard to his own actual personal sins.

(3.) "*And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.*" Gen. vi. 5. But a few verses farther on, we are certified that this depravity was not total nor constitutional. "And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh *had corrupted his way.*" Verse 12. This, of course, shows that they were not originally corrupt, that there was a time when "every imagination of the heart" was *not* "evil continually." If this had been their condition when born, it could not be said that "all flesh had corrupted their way." You cannot corrupt what is already corrupt by nature.

(4.) "*And were by nature the children of wrath,*

even as others." Eph. ii. 3. The argument drawn from this passage, is stated as follows: "If the Gentiles alluded to here were children of wrath, or deserving of punishment, *by nature*, then they must have been sinful *by nature;* otherwise they could not have deserved the wrath of God."

But the same apostle, as we have seen, says: "When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do *by nature* the things contained in the law," &c. Now, if they were by nature sinful, how could they by nature keep the law? Again, he says, God "will render to every man according to his works, . . . glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and *also to the Gentile.*" Of course, then, Gentiles and Jews, all men, are capable, *by nature*, of "working good," else this passage is without meaning. Again, in Galatians ii. 15, he says, "We who are Jews *by nature*, and not sinners of the Gentiles;" but, of course, he does not mean to say that the nature of a Jew is, constitutionally or morally, different from that of a Gentile; but differing only in birth, education, and condition.

These passages show that the phrase "by nature" does not imply original sin, or the inheritance of a perverted and depraved nature in consequence of Adam's transgression. All that is intended is, that the Gentiles being without the light and guidance of revelation, were *naturally*, i. e. from the nature of the case, by force of their circumstances and temptations, exposed to error and sin; and to the consequences resulting from them, expressed by the word "wrath" or punishment.

(5.) "*The natural man receiveth not the things of*

the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 14. It has been taken for granted, that the "natural man" here means morally corrupt by nature or creation; but it is without the slightest proof. Its literal signification is fleshly, or animal, in distinction from spiritual. It is used in three other passages in this epistle: "It is sown a *natural* (or animal) body, it is raised a spiritual body," "there is a *natural* body, and there is a spiritual body," "that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is *natural*," xv. 44, 46. It is plain that "natural" in these examples, refers to the flesh, the physical organization. In James iii. 15, and in Jude ver. 19, it is translated by the adjective "sensual," which properly conveys the meaning.

In these six texts, which are all the examples of its use in the New Testament, the meaning in five is perfectly plain, and determines its meaning in the passage in review: "The sensual man, (or the man who is in bondage to the flesh,) receiveth not the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned;" and the reason the apostle gives as follows: "For they that are after the flesh, do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the spirit, the things of the spirit." Then follows this passage:

(6.) "*The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither can be. So then they that are in the flesh* (or, as in the preceding verse, "who walk after the flesh,") *cannot please God.*" Rom. viii. 7, 8. The word carnal is assumed to mean inherited corruption, in a moral

sense; but, as usual, without proof. Paul speaks of the duty of the Gentile converts to minister to the "poor saints at Jerusalem in *carnal* things." Rom. xv. Did he mean things morally corrupt, or simply worldly things? So he says to the Corinthians, in regard to their contributions for his support, "we reap your carnal things." 1 Cor. ix. 11. And he speaks of "carnal ordinances." Heb. ix. 10. And he even calls the Corinthian Christians carnal, after they had been "born again." "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ, . . . for ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal?" &c. 1 Cor. iii. 1–4. Notwithstanding their conversion, these Corinthians were still carnal, or followed the world, and did the work of the flesh; showing thereby that their conversion was imperfect, a change of mind without a change of heart, whereof there are many examples in this day.

It is plain that "carnal" has substantially the same meaning with "natural;" not that of inherent depravity, or constitutional perversity and corruption, but of bondage to the fleshly appetites, a sensual and evil life. And this disposition and character are at enmity with God, not subject to his law of righteousness and purity. A man of this sort is averse to religion, and to the things of the spirit; he does not discern them, nor understand their value, nor know their joys; for these things are known only to those who "walk after the spirit," and are "followers of God as dear children." He "must be born again" before he can

enter into the kingdom of heaven, and become a true and accepted disciple of the Saviour. His heart must be reached, as well as his head; he must be renewed in spirit, and turn toward God with all his powers, consecrating himself to the new life of love and obedience, through Jesus Christ.

And this leads us on to the subject of the next chapter. If we have attained to a just Scriptural view of the nature and original condition of Man, the causes and results of his moral defection, and the miserable state to which sin has reduced him; we are in a position to understand and appreciate the doctrines of Regeneration and Salvation, as set forth in the Gospel. And it will not be difficult to discern the method and means by which the dead, in trespasses and sins, are quickened into life and obedience; or, in other words, how, through the truth and grace of Jesus Christ, and the renovating influence of the Holy Spirit, the life of the soul is renewed, and the repentant sinner restored to God, and reinstated in his communion and fellowship.

The argument of this chapter, however, will guard the inquirer against expecting to find the Scriptural doctrine of the New Birth, a supernatural change of the moral nature. If man is created upright, and falls into sin by his own act, he needs only a change of heart, purpose, character, and life; and not a change of nature, miraculously and instantly wrought by the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SCRIPTURAL TEACHING OF REGENERATION, OR THE NEW BIRTH — CONVERSION — WATER BAPTISM.

True to the original purpose of this work, I shall avoid, as far as possible, all metaphysical, and merely ethical discussion of the important subject of this chapter; and confine myself to the Scriptural definitions and presentation of it. But this treatment will necessarily include an exhibition, to some extent, of the great practical elements of the question, and their bearing upon the religious life of the individual. It will show the need of conversion, the means and the worth of Christian character, and the blessedness of self-consecration to God, and the work of the Gospel, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

At the same time, we shall find that the Scriptural doctrine differs widely, as hinted, and that on very essential points, from the doctrine commonly taught and received in the churches, even in its modernized forms. But the honest inquirer, the true Christian, will follow the teachings of the Bible in preference to those of the creeds; he will feel that Inspiration is a safer guide than the systems of even the profoundest theologians.

SECTION I.

BORN AGAIN — BORN OF GOD — BORN OF THE SPIRIT.

"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. . . . Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I say unto thee, ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." John iii. 1–13. See also chap. i. 12, 13, 1 John iv. 7; v. 1–5; 1 Pet. i. 23.

Now, the first inquiry respecting these passages is this: What is the meaning of the phrases "born again," "born of the Spirit," &c.? What did the Jews understand by this language? What was its usage among them?

The expressions in review, were common among the Jews, familiar as household words; and they attached to them a definite meaning, one well understood both by those uttering, and those hearing them. This meaning was conversion from Paganism to Judaism; and when in Jewish speech it was said of a man, that he was "born again," or that he was "a new creature," every body knew that he had renounced his heathen opinions and practices, and become a follower of Moses and the Law. No explanation was needed; it was the every day talk of Jews concerning idolaters who had turned from their idols to the worship of the true God.

For example: "If any one become a proselyte, he is like a child new born," the very same phrase used by Peter: "As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word." They say of Abraham, when he renounced idolatry, and became the friend of God, "He was made a new creature." So they say also, "He who repents must become like a new-born child."[1] Maimonides declares that "a Gentile who is become a proselyte, and a slave who is set at liberty, are both, as it were, new-born babes; which is the reason why those who were before their parents, are now no longer so."

These passages, quoted from their own writings, show the popular usage of the language, and the thing meant by it — viz.: a complete renunciation of Paganism, and the hearty reception of the religion of Moses.

Now, the thing which astonished Nicodemus was, that this language should be applied to him who was born a Jew, and could not, therefore, as he supposed, be proselyted or converted. It never occurred to him for a moment, that in becoming a disciple of Jesus, he was to cease to be a disciple of Moses; that in embracing the Gospel, he was to renounce the Law. He supposed that the Messiah had come, not to establish a new religion, but to reform and perfect the old, to exalt and magnify the religion of their great prophet Moses. The kingdom of God, or the reign of the Messiah, was to be only the extension and completion of the authority, dominion, and glory

[1] See Lightfoot, Schoettgen, Pearce, Hammond, and other learned critics, as quoted in Paige's Selections, and also in his Commentary on the place. *Horne's Introduction, Vol. iii., page* 261.

of the law dispensation. If this teacher, then, be the true Messiah, he reasoned, what can he mean by telling me that *I* must be born again, must become a new creature, or I cannot be accepted as his follower? He surely cannot mean that I must renounce my faith in Moses, my trust in the Law. Does he speak literally, then? If so, "how *can* a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time nto his mother's womb, and be born?"

The mistake of Nicodemus is well illustrated by Barnes: "It may seem remarkable that Nicodemus understood our Saviour literally, when the expression *to be born again* was in common use among the Jews to denote a change from *Gentilism* to *Judaism*, by becoming a proselyte by baptism. The word, with *them*, meant a change from the state of a heathen to that of a Jew. But they never used it as applicable to *a Jew*, because they supposed that *by his birth*, he was entitled to all the privileges of the people of God."

Seeing him thus doubtful and astonished at his words, the Saviour says, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." Do not be surprised that I apply this language to you and your countrymen; for I tell you plainly, that the conversion of Gentiles to the Law, does not imply a greater change of faith and practice, of heart and life, than that the Jews must experience in their conversion to the Gospel. And if this language is appropriate to describe the conversion of the idolater to the religion of Moses, it is equally appropriate to describe your conversion to the new religion which I now teach to you. And you must not only be born of water, or,

in other words, not only by baptism openly renounce Judaism and embrace the Gospel; but you must also be born of the Spirit, become a new man in the whole conduct of your life, a true and faithful follower of the Gospel of salvation.

And that Christ used the expression "born again" in the ordinary Jewish sense, is plain from his surprise that Nicodemus, being a master in Israel, did not understand him. If he had employed it in his conversation in the new and unusual sense of a change of nature, or a sudden, mysterious, and supernatural regeneration of the heart; he could not be surprised that Nicodemus misunderstood him, for *he* had never heard it used in this way. Beside this, that the Saviour did not refer to the conditions of entrance upon the immortal life, is proved by his own declaration: "If I have told you *earthly* things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things." This settles the point, that he was speaking, not of things belonging to the heavenly state, but of what pertained to the *earthly* sphere of his kingdom.

This passage thus explained, and thoroughly understood, we shall find the main thought of it pervading all the other passages where the phraseology occurs. And, indeed, it is worth while to observe, that out of twelve or thirteen examples of this phrase, "born again," "born of God," or "of the Spirit," *eleven* of them are in John's writings. Peter employs the expression only once, and then the original differs from that of John.

In the first chapter of the Gospel, it is those who "received him," and those "who believed in his

name," that are said to be "born of God;" showing that this last expression is a definition of the first, descriptive of faith, and confession toward Christ, of receiving and following him as *the* "Teacher come from God." So in the fifth chapter of his first epistle, the language is the same: "Whosoever *believeth* that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." Here it is belief in Jesus that determines the fact of the new birth; and he adds that "whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world," and immediately explains by saying "this is the victory that overcometh the world, *even our faith.* Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the son of God." This was the faith, and the victory over the fear of the world, to which the Saviour urged Nicodemus. But this certainly required no change in his moral constitution, nor does it in ours; but a change of opinion and action, a conquest of self, of prejudice and pride, of the fear of men, and the love of the world.

And this change of conduct, this new life of courage and manliness, of love toward God and man, is the proof of having been born again, the visible testimony to the work of the Spirit of Truth in the heart of the man. Hence John says again in the preceding chapter, "Behold, let us love one another, for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." How simple and intelligible this statement. A child can understand and master the subject presented in this form! Love is evidence of true faith. Whoever is understandingly converted to the religion of Jesus, is filled with love, love to the Father, and to all mankind, and thus shows that he

is born of God; for, as John says: "We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren." And so the words of Christ are confirmed: "*This is life eternal*, that they might *know* thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent." John xvii. 3.

So James recognises the means by which the new birth is accomplished, with perfect distinctness: "Of his own will begat he us *with the word of truth*, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures." i. 18; or, as Peter has it, "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God*." 1 Pet. i. 23; or, as Paul expresses it, "In Christ Jesus *I* have begotten you *through the Gospel*." 1 Cor. iv. 15. Thus we see that Paul claims to have done the same thing, that James says God did, in regard to effecting the new birth of these Gentile converts.

In the one case it is ascribed to God as the agent, and to the word of truth as the means; and in the other, to Paul as the agent, and to the Gospel as the means. God is the author of truth, or the Gospel, and Paul and Peter are the preachers of it; and through faith in this, these Gentiles were "begotten in Christ Jesus," were "born again;" or, in other words, entered into the kingdom of heaven, became followers of the Lord of life.

"Whosoever is born of God, sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself; and that wicked one toucheth him not." 1 John v. 18. That is, he who is born of God, *sinneth not habitually*, seeks to avoid evil and to follow good. Not that he *never* errs or sins, because John says in this very

epistle, "If we say that we have *no* sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; if *we confess our sins*, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins," &c. 1 John i. 8, 9.

And this is the way in which the new birth, or conversion, shows itself to-day as well as in the time of the Saviour and of John. He who has, in his heart, embraced the religion of Christ, "purifieth himself, even as he is pure;" and, notwithstanding occasional errors and short-comings, really strives after a life of holiness. And, outside of religious discussion, no one would imagine that there was anything supernatural in the cause or the process by which this conversion was brought about. Nor would any, independent of creeds, imagine that the change was the work of a moment; a sudden, instantaneous event. I do not say that it may not *begin* suddenly, in a moment; but it is never completed in a moment. It is the work of slow and steady growth. It is the product of months and years of watchings and prayings, of struggle and effort, of battles and victories.

Doubtless there is a turning point in the life of every man, when his attention is specially directed to religious things, a pivotal moment on which the whole character sweeps round toward heaven; but the force of this depends a good deal upon the previous life, the drift and tendency of his thoughts and feelings, his temper and aims. Where the previous life has been worldly and sinful, criminal and wicked, the change is greater, and more marked and visible, than in those cases where the man has always been moral and virtuous, good and kind-hearted. But in

both cases, it is only the *beginning* of a new life, not the completion of it;[1] the foundation of Christian character, which now, with much toil and struggle, is to be built up; or, as the Apostle says, "*grow* up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." Eph. iv.

This crisis of character, this conviction of sin, this sudden facing about toward heaven, is the result of a variety of causes, according to the variety of character, or of the circumstances of the individual. The Holy Spirit stands ever ready and waiting to enter into the soul of man, with its sanctifying and renewing power; ready to take up the varied experiences of life, and consecrate them as agencies in this divine work. Sometimes, therefore, it begins in one direction, and sometimes in another; these are brought to it by this event, and those by that event, entirely different, perhaps the opposite of the other.

Some noble action, or the example or entreaty of a beloved friend, or the beauty of a Chistian life, or the peacefulness and calm victory of a Christian death, may impress them, and lead to self-examination, and a resolution, to follow and obey the Saviour. Perhaps some affliction, or sudden bereavement, entirely changes their estimate of the world, and destroys their interest in all temporal things, reveals the

[1] Dr. GRIFFIN says, very correctly, "Regeneration is nothing more nor less than the *commencement* of holiness in the soul." *Park Street Lectures*, p. 118.

emptiness and vanity of their pursuits, and directs their thoughts and hopes to the eternal truth and life of the Gospel, as the only source of abiding comfort and strength. Or it may be that some unexpected blessing, some divine favor or mercy suddenly falling into their lot, quickens their gratitude toward God; and, reminding them painfully of their past indifference and selfishness, renews the heart in faith and affection. Or possibly an alarming providence, some great calamity, a severe sickness, or the near approach to death, may startle the conscience, and compel them to make an effort, at least, to answer the thousand questions which at such times come crowding upon the soul. Any or all these may be among the means by which this great change of character is inaugurated, the point from which dates the commencement of the new life in Christ.

And over and above these more obvious causes, it must be confessed of all, that God not unfrequently employs others more subtle, and beyond our understanding and explanation. He touches us with an invisible finger, and we can scarcely tell how or when; or, in the language of Jesus, as the wind bloweth where it listeth, and we know not whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth, so is the Spirit sometimes in its operations. Often thoughts come to us, we know not whence; impressions are made on us, strangely and mysteriously, we know not by what power or agency. Motives suddenly start to life within us, and we are moved to action, to an entire change of feeling or conduct in regard to certain things. We suddenly see ourselves, our lives, in a new light; and we cannot trace the cause of the

change, nor explain the origin of this new revelation, this secret influence acting on us. We feel only that the past is dead to us, with all its plans, and ambitions, and worldly interests; and that we must forthwith begin life anew, and aim at something better, and strive earnestly to get nearer to God and Christ. We do not feel that any miracle has come to us, but that God has spoken to us in a voice we never have heard before; that somehow, by the secret and subtle influences of his providence, we have been brought to a point where new interests have arisen, and the affections are wakened to new life, and we are resolved to follow after righteousness and true holiness, all the days of our life. And then comes the spirit of prayer and of communion with God; then, too, the word of truth, the gospel of salvation, are taken up with earnest study; and all the means of grace and regeneration are improved to the utmost, and with full purpose of heart to be "followers of God as dear children."

And now, the man to whom any one of these varied experiences has come, finds that the whole tone of his character is changed, that the whole effort of his life is heavenly. To use the beautifully descriptive language of Channing: "Once the dictates of conscience might have been heard; now they are obeyed. Once an occasional gratitude might have shed a transient glow through his heart; now the divine goodness is a cherished thought, and he labors to requite it by an obedient life. Once his passions were his lords; now he bows to the authority, and waits to hear the will of God. Once human opinion was his guide, and human favor the reward he proposed

to himself; now he feels that another eye is upon him, that his heart and life are naked before God, and to approve himself to this righteous and unerring judge, is his highest ambition. Once he was ready to repine and despond when his wishes and labors were crossed; now he sees a providence in life's vicissitudes, the discipline of a father in his sufferings, and bears his burdens, and performs his duties, with cheerful resignation to him who assigns them. Once he was sufficiently satisfied with himself, or unwilling to feel his deficiencies; now he is humble, conscious of having sinned, desirous to discover his errors, contrite in his acknowledgments, earnest in his application to Divine mercy, and resolute in his opposition to temptation. Once the thought of a Saviour suffering for his redemption, and rising from the dead to reveal immortality, excited little interest; now the promises, love, cross, and resurrection of Jesus, come home to him with power, and awaken gratitude and hope. Thus, by the precepts, doctrines, motives, promises of Christianity, and by the secret influence of God's Spirit on the heart, he has been raised to a faith, hope, and love, which may be called a new life. He has been born again."[1]

[1] CHANNING'S Memoirs, vol. i. pp. 256–258. There is a very valuable paper, by JOWETT, in his Commentary on Paul's Epistles, "On Conversion and Change of Character." It is suggestive, and shows the results of much thought and study. And it is significant of the direction of the new life which has begun to quicken the dead body of the English Church. The essay may be read also in Noyes' Collection of Theological Essays.

SECTION II.

REGENERATION—NEW CREATURE—NEW MAN—GIVING A NEW HEART—CREATING IN CHRIST JESUS—QUICKENING FROM THE DEAD, &c.

The phrases at the head of this section, and similar expressions in the Old and New Testaments, may seem to demand a special notice, as they appear to set forth more strongly, the direct and irresistible action of the Holy Spirit on the passive heart of man, in the work of the new birth or regeneration. And it must be allowed, that some of the texts cited in this behalf, are worded in very positive language.

"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. *A new heart also will I give you*, and *a new spirit will I put within you;* and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them."[1] Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27.

This is certainly put in strong terms; but the same God says, by the mouth of the same prophet, and to the same people: "Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby you have transgressed; and make ye a new heart and a new spirit; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Chap. xviii.

[1] It is to be observed that this language, which is perhaps the strongest in the Bible for the doctrine that "a change of heart" is wholly a supernatural work, is addressed to the "house of Israel," and refers to their return from captivity, the sorrows and sufferings of which led them to turn to God with their whole heart. Of course we cannot suppose a whole nation was instantly converted, by a radical change of nature, through the resistless action of the Holy Spirit.

Here the people are required to do for themselves the very thing which God declares *he* will do for them — viz.: to make a new heart and a new spirit. The simple truth is God and man, act together in this renewal, and sometimes it is attributed to one, and sometimes to the other. God gives the means, and man improves them, and the result is the new heart and spirit which obeys the statutes, and keeps the judgments of the Lord. And thus is illustrated the exhortation of Paul to the Philippians: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for *it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.*" ii. 12, 13.

So in Ephesians ii. 10., we have the expression, "We are his workmanship, *created in Christ Jesus unto good works*, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them," "the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." But in this very connection, the persons themselves are required to "put off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man," &c. So that if the "new man" *is* "created," he is required to aid in the work, to do his part toward being renewed in the spirit. It is not resistless grace on one hand, and passive inactivity on the other; but the joint work of the Spirit of God and the spirit of man. There is no change of nature, but a right use of the nature already possessed; nothing supernatural, but the improvement of appointed means to a purposed end.

"If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are

become new." 2 Cor. v. 17. The last half of the verse explains the first. He who became a Christian left everything behind, his old faith, and feelings, and practices, and sins; and in all these things became a new man, a new creature in Christ.

The language was common among the Jews. They said, "Proselytes to the true religion (i. e. the Law). *have their souls created anew.*" "He who converts another to the Law, virtually *creates* him." "The priest was made a new creature by the oil with which he was anointed." And of Abraham they said, that on the birth of Ishmael, "*he was made a new creature*, that he should beget sons, and become great over all."[1]

These examples show its Jewish usage, and show also how absurd it is to attempt to build up the doctrine of a supernatural change of human nature, on such elastic phraseology. It is certain that the Jews of Christ's time did not use it in this sense.

"And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." "And you being dead in sins, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." Eph. ii.; Col. ii. "Here," it may be said, "sinners are represented as morally dead, and if moral death is to the soul what natural death is to the body, then they could only be quickened into moral life by the absolute will, the omnipotent Spirit of God. They could do nothing toward it themselves. If the figure has any fitness or force, they must have been passive, and powerless to do good, till the Holy Spirit renewed or re-created

[1] SCHOETTGEN, as cited in Expositor ii. 198, First Series.

them. The dead cannot come to life by their own efforts."[1]

But after all this logic, the answer is in the language of inspiration itself: "Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and *arise from the dead*, and Christ shall give thee light." Eph. v. 14. Now here God calls upon the dead to arise of themselves, and light shall be given them. Either they were not so dead as to be unable to help themselves, or else God required an impossibility. Manifestly, whatever the moral condition symbolized by death, those in this condition still retained the power of moral action, and their freedom of will. And they were commanded to work with God in the struggle for a new life. Hence the apostle says, "We, then, *as workers together with him*, beseech you also, that ye receive not the grace of God in vain." 2 Cor. vi. 1.

And so with all the phraseology employed on this subject. A little examination of the language itself, of the context, or a comparison with other passages of the Bible, will show that two important facts stand out prominently: *First*,—That Regeneration does not imply a change in the moral constitution of man; but a change of opinion and character, of the desires and aims of life; a conversion from unbelief, or wrong belief, and wickedness, to faith, and truth, and holiness. *Second*,—That this change is not

[1] See Boston Review, for July, 1862; Hill's Lectures on Divinity, page 539. *Per contra*, see BUSHNELL'S Sermons on the New Life, pp. 116, 117: "This would be no proper regeneration of the man, but the generation of another man in his place . . . . a new creation by the fiat of Omnipotence." See also "Bibliotheca Sacra," for April, 1862. "*Doctrines of Methodism*," and compare with Wesley's teachings. The world certainly moves.

wrought in a moment, "by a supernatural and almighty influence, similar to that through which, by a word, God created the world, or raiseth the dead;" but is the result of a proper use of divinely appointed means, accompanied by the blessing of the Holy Spirit promised by the Saviour: "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you, for every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened." Matt. vii. 7.[1]

§ *Water Baptism; its relation to the New Birth.* Before closing, it may be well to call attention to one thing noticeable in all these allusions to conversion in the New Testament times, viz: the manner in which the baptism of the Spirit, a living and saving faith, is associated with water-baptism, as the symbol of the renunciation of the old religion and life, and the method of making public profession of the new. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." He must not only renounce his old religion or error, and confess the Truth, but he must do it publicly, not by

[1] If Adam transmitted a corrupt nature to his posterity, and regeneration or new-birth takes away this corrupt nature, and reinstates the subject of it in the primal innocence and purity of Adam before his fall — if this be the meaning of "taking away the stony heart" and giving "a new heart and a new spirit;" then how is it that children born of these regenerate parents, are born with corrupt natures, or with hearts prone to all evil? If sinners beget sinners by force of the moral law of human nature, then by the same law saints should beget saints. If the law of transmission hold good in the corrupt nature, why not in the regenerate nature? If an evil heart may be hereditary, why not "a new heart"? It *would* be so, if regeneration were a radical and constitutional change, the superinduction, or rather the substitution of a new moral nature.

night, as Nicodemus did; he must be baptized, and have courage openly to side with the truth of God.

To the same point is the language of Paul to Titus: 'But after that the kindness and love of God toward man appeared, not by works of righteousnes which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, *by the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." iii. 1–7.

The "washing of regeneration," is unquestionably baptism, or washing of water, the same which Jesus mentions, as a sign of "putting off the old man," and "putting on the new man;" and this was a symbol of the renewing or baptism of the Holy Spirit, through Jesus Christ, in whom "the kindness and love of God toward man appeared." And here, also, we see the means employed for their renewal or conversion from Paganism, and a life of wickedness,[1] to Christianity and a life of righteousness, viz: the gospel of divine love and redemption through Christ, and the gracious influences of the Spirit of God.

Paul makes "the washing of regeneration," *and* "the renewing of the Holy Spirit," two distinct things; as the Saviour did, "born of water *and* of the Spirit." In both cases it is "and," and not "or." "Regeneration" in the original, is simply "birth again," or "born again;" and the "washing" was the public baptism which witnessed to this new birth out of Judaism or Gentilism into the Gospel.

The same connection is seen in the command of

[1] "For we ourselves also were sometime disobedient, foolish, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." verse 3.

Christ to his disciples: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, *and is baptized*, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Mark xvi. 15, 16. Here we have the same union of faith and profession; not only must the convert believe, but he must openly confess his faith, and show the world that he is on the side of truth and righteousness. And as baptism at that time was the common method of doing it, this is accepted and sanctioned by the Saviour *for this specific purpose*. So in the Epistle to the Romans, we have this declaration: "If thou shalt *confess with thy mouth* the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." x. 9, 10.

In the first days of the Gospel, its reception and diffusion depended, in a great measure, on its disciples openly confessing it before the world. Hence much stress is laid on this, and Jesus, who had little regard for forms as such, insists that they who believe shall be *baptized*, because this was the recognized way, at that time, of making public profession of conversion and faith. And if they cannot take up this cross, if they have not courage and sincerity enough for this, they cannot be saved, or accepted as his disciples; they are not renewed in spirit, they have not yet wholly put off the old man, but are still "in bondage to the beggarly elements" of the world.

Whether water baptism is now, in Christian lands, to be regarded as a permanent rite, may be held as matter of question. Where children are, as it were,

born into the belief and acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah and Saviour, baptism cannot certainly have the significance it had in the days of ancient Judaism and Paganism, viz., the washing away of an old religion or faith, and embracing a new. Where the Gospel is preached in heathen lands, and idolaters are "born again," in the Scriptural sense of the term, the ordinance is unquestionably in force, and converts should be required to make public profession of their faith by water baptism.

Nor can any weighty objection be made to the observance o this rite, when a wicked man is converted from his evil ways, and is resolved to follow Christ as his Master and Saviour; provided it be properly explained, and the exact thing intended to be expressed by it, is understood. If he has been called of God to repentance and a holy life, and has obeyed the call; if he is truly born and baptized of the Spirit, and is desirous to confess the faith in this ancient form; we should be disposed in this case, and in all like cases, to take up the words of Peter in the house of Cornelius, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." Acts x.

The doctrine of Regeneration, its producing cause and resultant effects, clearly understood; we are ready to enter upon the inquiry respecting the nature of Salvation, what it is, and what it does, for man. And we shall see, in the progress of the investigation, that Salvation is the end or completion of that heavenly work in the soul, that life of consecration to God, of which the New Birth is the beginning. The

New Birth is that change of affections, desires, and interests, by which the heart is turned away from earth to heaven, with an earnest effort to realize in itself, the divine life of Christ. Salvation is that effort realized, that divine life attained, as far as possible in this world; it is that spiritual condition in which the whole tide of thought, desire, purpose, character, and conduct, sets steadily and strongly to-toward God, and to whatsoever is pleasing in his sight.

CHAPTER V.

SALVATION—WHAT IT IS? THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE.

The subject of this chapter is the most important, perhaps, in the whole range of religious discussion and inquiry. It is more personal than any other: it relates to the highest interest of the soul; it appeals to our fears and our hopes, to our affections and aspirations, to all that we love and all that we desire; it is the question of destiny for time and eternity.

It is not alone what is to become of mankind, but what is to become of me? What am I? Whence came I? and whither do I go when the "silver cord" of this life is loosed? What is the purpose of my being on this earth? What does Christ come to me for? and what does he seek to accomplish in me? and for me? How is he a Saviour? and what does he save me from? What is redemption through his blood? Is it present or future; before death, or after death, or both? Is it deliverance from the evil of our own hearts, or from some evil outside of us? from judgment and punishment, or from a moral condition and life which bring these? Is it union with God, the life of Christ in the soul, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, whenever and wherever these are realized?

These are the questions which crowd upon us at the very threshold of any inquiry into the object of

Christ's mission, or the nature of Christian salvation. I can only indicate the way, and point out some of the leading features of the question; and then leave the reader, with the New Testament in his hand, to follow the investigation to its results, confident that he cannot miss the truth on this all-important subject.

It is singular that it has so long been taken for granted, in the Christian church, that salvation is deliverance from punishment, from the penalty of the divine law, from hell in the sense of endless torment, from the consequences of sin; instead of from sin itself, from the dominion and bondage of an evil heart and a wicked life, and a translation into the glorious liberty of the children of God. And it is the more so from the fact, easily verified by examination, that never, in a single instance of the multitude of texts where the words *Saviour*, *save*, and *salvation*, are used, are they connected with any such idea or definition of salvation. Nor is there more than one passage in which the usage of the terms could suggest such a mistake in regard to the true nature of redemption by Christ.

It is possible that Romans v. 9, might be taken inferentially, to mean something of this sort: "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, *we shall be saved from wrath* through him." The word "wrath" here may be supposed to refer to the judgment of God against sin; but even if it do, it is not the judgment or punishment of sins already committed, that is meant. What the apostle intends to say is, that we are saved, by Christ, from a sinful and wicked life; and, so far, are saved from the judg-

ments which follow, as the natural and necessary consequence of a wicked life.

Beside, the phraseology in this case is peculiar. It is not by the death of Christ, through which, according to the popular theology, the atonement is made, but by his *life* that we are saved from this wrath. "We shall be saved from wrath through him; for if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." That is, the death of Christ, as an exhibition of divine love, has reconciled us to God, filled our hearts with gratitude and affection; and the beauty of his divine life wins us to himself, and so saves us from all the evils of a sinful life, and that "wrath of God which cometh upon the children of disobedience." Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6.

Let us proceed now to the direct testimony respecting the nature of the salvation which Christ came to work out in man, and for man. In the first of the following passages, the Saviour speaks for himself, and that, too, at the very commencement of his ministry on earth. He reads the words of the prophet Isaiah, in the synagogue at Nazareth, and applies them to himself. Of course, he knows what God the Father sent him into the world to do; he knows whether he came to save the world from sin, or from the punishment of sin; whether his salvation is internal and spiritual, or external, from some evil coming upon the soul from without.

SECTION I.

DIRECT TESTIMONY RESPECTING THE NATURE OF SALVATION.

Luke iv. 16–22. "And Jesus came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read. . . . . And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, and to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." [1]

In this public announcement of the objects of his advent on earth, and the character of the salvation he was sent to work out in the soul of man, there is no allusion to deliverance from the wrath of an angry God, or the penalties of the divine law, or the legitimate claims of divine justice, or the terrors and torments of an endless hell. And his entire silence on these points, in this his inaugural address on entering upon his ministry, is the most demonstrative and conclusive proof of the falsehood of these dogmas of the churches and schools.

It is plain enough, to the most indifferent reader, that the salvation which Jesus sets forth, in his prophetic testimony, as the work on which he was sent

[1] Why did Jesus stop in the middle of the sentence, and leave out the important declaration, "*and the day of vengeance of our God?*" doubly and trebly important if he came to save us from this. How do believers in this doctrine explain the omission! See the passage in Isaiah lxi. 1–3.

of the Father, is spiritual salvation, the enlightenment of the mind, the purification of the heart, and the peace and comfort of a perfect faith in God. It is good tidings to the poor and friendless, the forsaken and broken-hearted, good tidings of a Father's love and protection, the promise that he will cause all things to work together for their good, and, in the fulness of time, wipe away all tears from their eyes; liberty to those in captivity to sin; light and sight to those blinded by error; and healing and restoration to those that are bruised and wounded in the conflict with temptation and evil.

Other passages are to the same point, that the redemption of Christ is from sin.

Acts iii. 25. "God having raised up his Son Jesus, *sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.*" This is testimony direct to the question. The inspired apostle informs us that Jesus was sent expressly to save us from *iniquity*, not from the punishment of iniquity. The salvation is moral, is within the soul, is present to us here the moment we believe in Jesus, and receive his spirit. Then sin has no more dominion over us as our master, but we follow after holiness; we are washed and made clean through the blood of Christ.

Matt. i. 21. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall *save his people from their sins.*" Here the heavenly messenger, direct from the presence of God, declares that the very name of the wonderful child shall be descriptive of his work. He is to be called Jesus, the Saviour, because he is to save his people from their *sins*. Of course, his people are sinners, or they would need no salvation. Only sinners can be

saved; only the sick can be healed. The salvation of the sinner, is the healing of the soul, the removal of the palsy of sin, and its restoration to righteous health and strength. What palsy is to the body, sin is to the soul. What healing is to the body, redemption is to the soul.

Titus ii. 11–14. "For the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might *redeem us from all iniquity, and purify* unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."[1]

Nothing can be more explicit and conclusive than the entire phrasing of this passage. It not only affirms that Christ gave himself to redeem us from ini-

[1] Paul did not say that "the grace of God had appeared to *all men*" at the time he wrote; for it had appeared to comparatively very few. It has not appeared to all men even now, after eighteen centuries. What he did say was, "the grace of God that *bringeth salvation to all men*, hath appeared"—and the translators have put this in the margin, when they ought to have put it in the text. The Greek is Ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις; which literally translated is, "For there has appeared the grace of God, bringing salvation to all men." Bloomfield says, "πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις must be construed not with ἐπεφάνη, but with ἡ σωτήριος." The Vulgate has, "*apparuit enim gratia Dei salutaris omnibus hominibus.*" Beza has the same construction; and the French Protestant version of Paris renders it, "*Car la grace de Dieu salutaire a tous les hommes a ete manifestee.*" Dr. A. Clarke justly says: "Had our translators, who were excellent and learned men, *leaned less to their own peculiar creed in the present authorized version*, the Church of Christ would not have been so agitated and torn as it has been with polemical divinity." Note on Heb. vi. 6.

quity, to save us from sin; but the whole connection is built upon the fact, that salvation is from ungodliness, and worldly lusts, and evil works.

The *doctrine* is, that Christ comes to redeem us from sin; and the *precept* consequent upon this doctrine is, that we should, therefore, deny all ungodliness, and wicked works, and live soberly and righteously, in this present world. This is the practical teaching of "the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men;" and, as every one sees, from the nature of the salvation, the practice, or the morality enjoined, is the logical sequence or necessity of the doctrine. The injunction to "live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world," brings us naturally to the next testimony.

Galatians i. 3–5. "Grace be unto you, and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from *this present evil world*, according to the will of God and our Father: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

Is not this a strange and inexplicable passage, if Christ came to save us from the torments of a *future* evil world? If the popular theory be correct, if this *is* what the Saviour delivers us from, is it not passing wonderful that the Holy Spirit should dictate to Paul to write "*this present* evil world," instead of "*that future* evil world?"

Is it not plain, then, from this witness of the inspired apostle, that the salvation which Christ comes to accomplish for the human race, is deliverance from the actual sin and moral corruption of the life that now is, and not from threatened punishments in the

life to come? Is it not proof indisputable that Christian salvation is inward and spiritual, and not outward and material; from disobedience itself, and not from the penalties of disobedience? It would seem impossible to imagine testimony more positive in language, or more direct to the point in review.

John i. 29. "John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away *the sin* of the world." Here, again, the witness is the same, "he taketh away the *sin*," not the punitive consequence of sin, not the penalties of that law of which sin is the transgression. And John the apostle is in perfect agreement on this point with John the Baptist, for he testifies that "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us *from all sin*." 1 John i. 7. And the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews has the same testimony: "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge the conscience *from dead works* to serve the living God." ix. 14. From sin and dead works, the blood of Christ redeems us, purges the conscience, and restores us to the service of the living God.

There is a remarkable passage, on this point, in Paul's Epistle to Titus, chapter iii: "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Here salvation is directly identified with a thorough reform of character, a deliverance from evil feelings and habits, from hateful lusts and passions, a conversion from an ungodly and wicked life, to a life of holiness and obedience to God. And, observe, that this salvation is not future, but past; it had already been realized — "he *saved* us." And then he urges Titus so to preach to them that they may continue in a godly life, or continue in this salvation: "that they which have believed in God, might be careful to maintain good works" — faith and practice, one and inseparable. Observe, also, that this conversion and salvation was wrought out by the manifestation through Christ of "*the kindness and the love of God* our Saviour;" not by his wrath or judgments, not by the terrors of the law, or the fear of a fabled hell. The apostle offers no thanks for an escape from these; nor does he so much as allude to them, but speaks with grateful heart of being saved from their former vicious, sensual, and sinful life.

These Bible winesses might be indefinitely multiplied, but what has thus far been adduced, is sufficient to justify us in saying, that if Christ did come to save us from the just and deserved punishments of sin, if he did come to ransom us from the torments of a future world, the men of God who are teachers, the Saviour himself, the Holy Spirit of Inspiration, have not only failed to say this, but they have substituted something else entirely different in the place of it! This the Christian cannot believe, and therefore he must no longer associate with the beautiful words "salvation," "redemption," "reconciliation," the

false idea of deliverance from pains and penalties, but deliverance from the evil heart of unbelief which brings these. He need strive no more to escape a future hell; but let him labor to escape from the present captivity of sin, from the bondage of his lusts and passions, "into the glorious liberty of the children of God." This is heaven, or at least the beginning of it; and it is as real now as in the future, as possible on this side the grave as on the other. [1]

SECTION II.

FIGURES AND METAPHORS ILLUSTRATING THE NATURE OF SALVATION.

There are numerous figures of speech in the Scriptures, which will help us to understand the kind of redemption which Jesus brings to the soul of man. A brief review of a few of these will add to the preceding argument, and shed light upon this important inquiry.

[1] WESLEY seems to have seen the truth on this point: "By salvation, I mean not barely, *according to the vulgar notion*, deliverance from hell, or going to heaven, but a present deliverance from sin. Now, if by salvation we mean a present salvation from sin, we cannot say holiness is the condition of it; for *it is the thing itself*." Ward's "View of all Religions."

The following from an *orthodox* journal is prophetic of progress: "The general idea of salvation is, that it consists in going to a certain place, called heaven. With this *place* is connected the idea of being perfectly happy. This, however, is a very loose way of thinking on so momentous a subject.—It is not the place that makes the inhabitants what they are, but it is they that make the place what it is. Heaven is what it is because of the *character* of those who dwell there. Any world—any place would be a heaven, if filled with perfectly holy beings. Whether a man is saved or not depends on what he *is*, not on where he *goes*. The sinner desires salvation, or complete happiness. He will get it, not by a change of place, not by going out of the body, not by getting into the company of the good, but by getting rid of his *moral malady*—by becoming holy."

1. *We are refined and purified as silver.* Mal. iii. 1–3. "For he is like a refiner's fire, ... he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness."

This figure shows that Christ saves us from something from which we are to be purified, something that makes a part of us now, and from which we are to be separated by a refining process like that which separates the pure silver from the dross. Now, this language is not, in any sense applicable to punishment, to the penalty of the divine law, the wrath of God, or any of their equivalents. We cannot be purified *from* judgments, though we may be purified *by* them, spiritually refined and separated from our sins in the fiery furnace of suffering.

To say Christ is like a refiner of silver, because he saves us from the torments of hell, or bears the wrath of God in our stead, is to make a comparison where there is no likeness, no resemblance of the things compared. But there *is* a resemblance between him who purifies the soul from sin, and one who purifies the silver from dross. And in this sense Jesus is a Refiner and Purifier, separating the spiritual from the sensual, bringing out the heavenly from its mixture with the earthly dross, and preparing it to receive anew the image and superscription of God.

The thought, or truth, of this figure, is found in many other texts. Peter, speaking of the Gentiles, says: "God put no difference between us and them, *purifying* their hearts by faith." Acts xv:9. Again,

he says, in his first Epistle: "Seeing ye have *purified* your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit." i. 22. Here the heart, the soul, are purified, which, of course, is an inward personal salvation, and not redemption from threatened judgments. John says: "He that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure." 1 John iii. 3. How is Christ pure? In any sense that would represent him as saved from punishment? Of course not, but in the sense of entire freedom from sin, "a lamb without spot or blemish."

2. *We are cleansed and washed.* The passage already cited from Malachi, declares also that the Saviour is "like fuller's soap," i. e. that his truth and grace act on the soul, as soap acts on a soiled garment; only in one sense, of course, that of cleansing, the one acting by spiritual, and the other by chemical laws. The idea embodied in this figure pervades the New Testament. After naming certain kinds of evil persons who cannot, as such, or while in that condition, enter the kingdom of God, or be received as followers of Christ, the apostle says: "And such were *some of you;* but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified," &c. 1 Cor. 6. 11. "Unto him that loved us, and *washed* us from our sins in his own blood." Rev. i. 5. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to *cleanse* us from all unrighteousness." 1 John i. 9. And the passage already quoted from the same chapter, "The blood of Jesus Christ *cleanseth* us from all sin."

The metaphor running through these texts, is perfectly descriptive of the nature and process of salva-

tion. You cannot wash a person from the penalty of the law; you cannot cleanse him from punishment. There is no fitness to the comparison; the figure fails altogether. But it is full of meaning and beauty when employed to describe gospel salvation, which is being "washed from our sins," and "cleansed from all unrighteousness," through the grace and truth of our Lord Jesus Christ.

3. *We are healed as of a disease.* This figure has been partially considered in the preceding section; but we call attention to it again, that the principle involved may be carefully considered in its negative and positive relations. Christ himself authorizes the language, when he justifies himself for keeping company "with publicans and sinners," by saying, "They that be whole need not a *physician*, but they that are sick." Matt. ix. 12. The Psalmist has the same metaphor: "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits: who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases." ciii. 2, 3.

According to the parallelism of Hebrew verse, the forgiving iniquities and healing diseases in this passage, are the same thing. The forgiveness, or removal of iniquity or sin from the soul, which is salvation, is set forth by the figure of healing, or removing of disease from the body. But the physician who cures the sick man, does not do it by taking his sickness, or bearing the pain of it; but by driving out the disease. So Jesus does not save us by bearing for us the punishment of sin; but by driving out the sin from the heart. A man cannot be cured or healed of endless torment — there is no point or meaning to such a figure — but he *can* be cured of

his moral disease; he *can* be healed of the leprosy of sin, by the grace of Jesus, by the Spirit of God.

4. *Christ is our Teacher; and we are saved by the Truth.* "We know that thou art a teacher come from God." John iii. "We know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth." Matt. xxii. This metaphor also illustrates the spiritual and personal nature of salvation, and shows in part what it is from — ignorance, error, and unbelief. When a man becomes my teacher, he does not stand as my substitute; he does not take upon himself and suffer all the evils of my ignorance; but he instructs me, he enlightens me by imparting knowledge, or helping me to obtain it. Salvation, therefore, if this metaphor has any propriety or significance in it, bears the same relation to the spirit which knowledge bears to the intellect.

And this element of salvation, and this method or process, are recognized in many important passages. "I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, ... for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the *knowledge of the truth.*" 1 Tim. ii. Here "to be saved," and "to come to the knowledge of the truth," are equivalent terms, meaning the same thing. Hence the Saviour says: "This *is* life eternal, that they might *know* thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John xvii. The knowledge of God and his Son is eternal life, salvation, deliverance from ignorance and unbelief, through the enlightening influence of the Gospel and the Spirit of Truth.

5. *We are found, as the lost.* "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Luke xix. The parable of the lost sheep, in chapter xv., is familiar to all. The good shepherd seeks it among the mountains and in the wilderness, till he finds it; and then, laying it on his shoulder, he brings it in safety, and with rejoicing, to the fold.

In what sense can the punishment of sin be represented under the figure of being lost? or deliverance from this under the figure of being found? It is an easy and appropriate metaphor, which describes him who wanders from the paths of truth and righteousness, as lost in the wilderness of sin; and, when he is restored to them again, as found. When the prodigal returned from the far country of his folly and wickedness, the rejoicing father exclaimed, "My son, that was lost, is found."

But note again, how the figure tells *against* the popular doctrine of salvation, and *for* the Scriptural doctrine. The shepherd who went in search of the lost sheep, did not suffer the pains and terrors which were the consequence of being lost. The poor sheep endured for itself all the evils of going astray, through all the long days and nights of its wandering. Nobody could save it from these. It had already suffered them. They could not be borne by another. They could not be separated from its lost condition, any more than the shadow can be separated from the substance, or the pain from a broken limb, or blindness from loss of sight.

These figures and metaphors might be largely increased, but the examples given are sufficient to show how the great truth that salvation is from sin and

wickedness, from blindness of mind, and unbelief, and moral corruption, pervades the entire body of the Scripture, its doctrines and precepts, the character of its thought, and the structure of its language. I have given more space to this subject, and enforced the point at the risk of repetition, because I regard it as the pivot on which the whole Christian system turns.

If the punishment of sin inheres in the very substance of sin itself, then no one can suffer it for us; and the sacrificial scheme, as we have shown under the head of "Atonement," falls to the ground. The thing it proposes is simply impossible; and the only way for us to escape the punishment, is to abandon the sin. If we would be delivered from the murderer's doom, we must avoid the murderer's crime. If the drunkard would escape from the hell in which he lives, he must repent, and thoroughly reform. If any would be saved from the torments of envy, jealousy, hatred, malice, these foul spirits must be expelled from the heart. If we would not confront the terrors and tortures of a guilty conscience, we must keep it pure and without offence. If we would be delivered from all anxiety and doubts, from that "fear which hath torment," we must believe in Christ, we must know God, and trust in him; and then shall we enter into rest, and find peace passing knowledge. This is the practical bearing of the subject; its direct influence on life and action. And thus the true doctrine of Salvation links itself in natural and logical sequence with the true doctrine of Atonement.

Then, again, if salvation is from sin, it is not from

endless punishment — and this monstrous accusation against God, is proved to be wickedly false, and his character stands forth in all the attractions of a Father's love, of infinite and everlasting goodness. This understood, and the hardness of the sinner's heart is subdued; the prodigal no longer stays away from home, through fear of his Father's anger; or lest he will reduce him to the condition of a servant and slave, instead of receiving him as a son. He will not wait until it comes to famine and starvation; but penitent for the past, and painfully instructed for the future, he will, long ere this, arise and go to his Father. And thus, again, we see how the true Scriptural teaching of Salvation stands related to the doctrine of Rewards and Punishments, of the law and its penalty.

There is no religious question of more practical importance, than this respecting the nature of salvation — what it is; what it does for us; how we are to obtain it; where we are to enjoy it. And if it can be fully apprehended and settled in the mind of the inquirer, it speedily clears the ground of many pernicious and dangerous errors; and leads not only to a complete re-adjustment of Christian doctrines, but also to a complete change of character, of the motives to obedience, of the aims and purposes of life. Election and reprobation, salvation and damnation, heaven and hell, rewards and punishments, will all be shaped into harmony with this central truth.

The true Scriptural, Evangelical doctrine, then, on this momentous subject, is this, viz.: that salvation is moral and spiritual; that it is not exemption from the just retribution of wrong, but redemption from

the wrong itself; not from one thing, but from many things — from error and false doctrines, from unbelief, from sin and all unrighteousness, from hatred, and malice, and envy, from the bondage of passion and hurtful lusts, from the outward criminal act, and from the inward criminal desire — conversion *from* these *to* faith and obedience, to holiness of life and heart, to sincere reverence and affection toward God and the Saviour, to charity and love for all mankind; in a word, it is a regenerate and sanctified spirit, which makes the whole being consecrate to God, and the whole life beautiful as that of the angels. And, when it comes to this with us, we are, to that extent, in heaven, whether in the present life or in the future, whether in this world or in any other. [1]

But it may be said, that *all men* are not saved, in this life, in the sense of salvation here set forth; that thousands die in ignorance, unbelief, and sin. This is true; and it is not affirmed by our argument, that all men, or any, are *perfectly* saved in this world. No one, in this life, attains to that spiritual freedom and angelic perfection, represented by the "image of

[1] I think also that one important element of Christian salvation is, as shown under the head of *Atonement*, deliverance from the fear of death. The doctrines of Jesus respecting the character of God, and of the future life, and his own death and resurrection, were intended to inspire us with hope, and courage, and peace in the hour of death. Hebrews ii. 14, distinctly affirms this: "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver those who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage." And how truly this salvation is accomplished in the believer, is abundantly shown by the manner in which death is always mentioned in the New Testament; and beautifully illustrated by the epitaphs of the early Christians in the Catacombs of Rome, as well as by the death of every true believer.

the heavenly," of which Paul speaks; or, in other words, no one reaches the full stature of the heavenly state while in the body. Therefore, no soul, however advanced, realizes the full measure of salvation, till through the resurrection it is made equal unto the angels of God.

And this is Ancient Universalism. Origen (A. D. 230,) says: "The *Word*, which is the Wisdom of God, shall bring together all intelligent creatures, and convert them into his own perfection, through the instrumentality of their free will and their exertions. For though, among the disorders of the body, there are, indeed, some which the medical art cannot heal, yet we deny, that of all the vices of the soul, there is any which the supreme *Word* cannot cure; for the *Word* is more powerful than all the diseases of the soul, and he applies his remedies to each one according to the pleasure of God. And the consummation of all things, will be the extinction of sin, and the reformation of every soul, so that all shall serve him with one consent. This may not, indeed, take place with mankind, in the present life, but be accomplished after they shall have been liberated from the body.[1]

But the discussion of this point carries us over into the subject of the next chapter; to which we pass now for the completion of the argument.

[1] *Contra Celsum*, Lib. viii. This work is Origen's celebrated defence of Christianity against the attacks of the heathen philosopher whose name it bears—Celsus. CLEMENT of Alexandria, speaking of the unbelieving and unconverted, says: "How is he a Saviour and Lord, unless he is the Lord and Saviour of all? He is certainly the Saviour of those who have believed; *and of those who have not believed he is Lord, until by being brought to confess him, they shall receive the blessing suited and adapted to them!*"—*Stromata* Lib. vii. cap. ii. A. D. 195.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

I do not propose, in this chapter, to discuss the various theories respecting the time, nature, and processes of the resurrection, current among Christians; but only to examine the Scripture statements, so far as they relate to the great question of human destiny — though I shall not refuse to notice such points respecting the philosophy of the mind and affections, as may legitimately come into the examination. But the main facts to be established by the Bible testimony, will not be affected by any theory relative to the time of the resurrection; and the arguments will have equal weight, whether it is progressive or instantaneous at some future period; whether it is experienced, in its commencement, by each individual at the time of death, or by all at the end of the world.

SECTION I.

THE RESURRECTION — A MORAL AND SPIRITUAL, AS WELL A BODILY, CHANGE.

The passages which treat of the resurrection to immortality, set forth two important facts in very clear and intelligible language. And these are,

§ I. *That we are clothed upon with an incorruptible and spiritual body, suitable to our new sphere of existence.*

The apostle, Paul, establishes this fact by the plainest statements, in his first epistle to the Corinthians. The question is proposed thus: "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" The fact that this earthly body decomposes, and falls away, after death, into the dust out of which it was formed, was apparent to all. It is plain that the spirit abandons it, no longer inhabits it, no longer uses it. What body, then, does it have, in the resurrection? This Paul answers very directly, by saying it is *not* this body, "but God *giveth it a body* as it hath pleased him." He *gives* it a body when it enters the resurrection world, a new body, as he *gave* it a body when it entered into this world. The earthly body is suited to the earthly state; and the heavenly body to a heavenly state. "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body," . . . "as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly — and as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

The apostle proceeds to illustrate this point from the natural world: "That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain." The body dies, and only the germ or soul of the grain lives, and that is clothed upon with a new body; in the likeness of the old, to be sure, but created anew, out of the vital forces of the soil and the atmosphere, out of the invisible elements of air, water, light, electricity. So the earthly body dies, and the soul is clothed upon anew; God *giveth* it a body fitted to its new sphere of life and activity.

In the second epistle to the Corinthians, Paul introduces the subject again: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, (not the same house which was dissolved, not the old house repaired or altered, but a new building of God,) eternal in the heavens. For in this (earthly house,) we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." Plainly, this house from heaven is a different thing from the earthly one already dissolved; and the distinction set up between the two, is so sharp, that we cannot well suppose the one is to be built up out of the other; or that any part of the material of the earthly body, or house, is to be manufactured, or wrought up into the heavenly body, or the "house from heaven."

In the absence of all facts and Scriptural information, we abstain from speculating as to the nature of the resurrection body. It is enough for us to know that it is adapted to our heavenly estate, to our growth in knowledge of the divine character and attributes, as displayed in the numberless worlds scattered through the abysses of the universe. Thus fitted to the wants and uses of the spirit, it is of little consequence what its peculiar characteristics may be, or whether it is created in part of the old structure or not. The drift of the language, where the subject is touched, certainly seems to intimate that the "spiritual body" is wholly a new body; and that so far as the word resurrection is concerned, it implies the calling of the soul out of the earthly body, now dead, into this heavenly body, being thus exalted, or born

again, into a higher and nobler life. And this leads to the other important fact indicated by the New Testament teachings on this point, which is,

§ II. *That the Resurrection is a moral and spiritual change — the anastasis, or raising up, of the soul.*

The word ἀνάστασις which is generally translated by the English word "resurrection," does not necessarily imply, that those to whom it refers, should be dead. It is often used in regard to the living, and means, in its most literal definition, *a rising up*, or *a being lifted up, exaltation*, as respects condition or circumstances. Dr. Campbell says: "It denotes simply, being raised from inactivity to action, or from obscurity to eminence, or a return to such a state, after an interruption. The verb *anistemi* has the like latitude of signification; and both words are used, in this extent, by the writers of the New Testament, as well as by the Seventy. Agreeably, therefore, to the original import, *rising* from a seat is properly termed *anastasis*, so is *awaking* out of sleep, or *promotion* from an inferior condition. The word is used in this last sense, in Luke ii. 34."

The passage referred to, reads thus: "Behold this child is set for the fall and rising again (*anastasis*,) of many in Israel:" meaning that his humble condition would be a stumbling block to the Jews, who, for this reason, would reject him; but who would, nevertheless, in the fulness of time, by faith in him, be restored, or raised to spiritual life again, as set forth in Romans xi.

So when it refers to the future life, it implies a raising up, an exaltation, of the whole man; not only in

a bodily respect, but also in a moral and spiritual respect. The resurrection is not simply being lifted out of the mortal into the immortal, out of the earthly into the heavenly; but out of the imperfect into the perfect, out of the weakness, and frailty, and sinfulness of our present estate, into the strength and holiness, and spiritual completeness of the future state.

"It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." Now, supposing this language to refer to the body solely, it is manifest enough that it is universal in its application, that it is descriptive of the resurrection body which all are to inhabit. The apostle is not speaking of a class, but of "the dead," in its general meaning; not of the righteous, but of all who have borne "the image of the earthy," which phrase cannot be made to mean less than all mankind.

If, then, this language describes the resurrection body, it needs nothing more to show that the resurrection state, is one of universal holiness and happiness; for it would be difficult to show how a soul dwelling in an incorruptible, glorious, spiritual body, could be unholy and miserable. No soul, in such a heavenly habitation as is here portrayed by Paul, could possibly be in a moral condition, or in a state of suffering, represented by the word "hell."

But it seems obvious that the language quoted has to do with more than the body, that it takes in the *anastasis*, or up-rising, into a higher life of the whole being. It is the question, both of the fact and char-

acter of a future life. This is evident, from the entire argument of the chapter. It was not simply the difficulty involved in the question, "With what body do they come?" but whether they come at all; whether, when the body perishes, anything remains. This was the point in dispute among that portion of the half pagan converts of the Corinthian church, who had initiated the controversy. And it is to this point Paul directs his reply, covering the whole ground of doubt and inquiry, embracing three distinct heads:

1. The fact of a resurrection, or a future life, based on the resurrection of Christ as the proof of its possibility, and the pledge of its actuality and certainty in regard to all men.

2. The nature of the resurrection body, or the fact that, though the earthly body dies, that is not a difficulty in the way of the first position; since God *giveth* to the soul, as to the various seeds, a new body, as it pleaseth him.

3. The character of the future life, or the anastasis or exaltation of the soul, when clothed upon by this new body.

These particulars, to be sure, are not logically distributed and argued, independently of each other; for, from the very nature of the subject, the thought of one naturally mingles with, and flows into, that of the others; but the three points named, constitute the substance of Paul's statement of the case, as will be seen by an examination of the language employed.

1. "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen,

then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. . . . . Then they also, that are fallen asleep in Christ, *are perished*, (i. e. are annihilated, do not live at all.) If *in this life only* we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." The argument is plain — If Christ has not risen, there is no future existence, the dead are perished, and we have hope only in this life; and of all men, therefore, we are most miserable, because we endure such persecution and suffering in defence of the resurrection of the dead. "But now *is* Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." Verse 20. This is an established fact, and, therefore, our faith is not in vain.

But, as is frequently the case with the Bible writers, Paul's argument, in the following verses, 20–28, passes over from the logical fact to the moral accompaniments of the fact, and takes in a brief view of the results of this universal anastasis, or resurrection through Jesus Christ, viz: the destruction of all the enemies to his reign and man's happiness, even to the last, which is death, and the spiritual subjection of all souls, even of the Son himself, to the Father, that God may be all in all!

2. But if the dead live, how do they live? Since this body dies, and turns to dust, "with what body do they come?" or what body do they inhabit in the resurrection life? This is answered directly in verses 35–38, by showing that as God gives a new body to the germ or soul of the grain, whose old body perishes when it is sown; so he gives a new heavenly body to the spirit or soul of man, when the old earthly body perishes in the grave.

And here, again, as in the first point reviewed, the argument reaches over into the next particular; and he naturally mixes up with the statement, that the soul will be clothed upon with a heavenly and glorious body, the necessary conclusion that it will be in a heavenly and glorious condition. This is shown in verses 42–57, as set forth in the next paragraph.

3. "It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power; it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory." "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly."

That is, as Adam represents our earthly condition, so Christ represents our heavenly condition; and as in this life we are in the likeness of the first man, so in the future life we shall be in the likeness of the second man. For "as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly; and as is the heavenly, so are they that are heavenly." "The dead," not the righteous only, but "*the dead*," — embracing all who have departed, as strictly as the expression "the living," embraces all who remain — "shall be raised incorruptible, and *we* shall be changed."

The contrast is between the dead and the living; and the word "we" shows that he is speaking of the race, of mankind in their continuous relation to each other, since he, and those he addressed, are dead long time ago, and the end is not yet.

The apostle declares that, at the final consummation ("the end" of which he had previously spoken) some would be living; and though these would not

die, yet they would be changed into the likeness of the heavenly; or, in other words, would be clothed upon with the immortal body, and the heavenly image, by a change equivalent to that through which the dead pass; leaving behind them the earthly tabernacle, and the earthly drift of character which fettered and held them in this life. And so the sting of death, which is sin, being destroyed, and death swallowed up in the victory of life immortal, all will take up the joyous cry, "O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory? Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!"

The main doctrine of Paul, in this chapter, is clearly and authoritatively established by the Saviour, in his controversy with the Sadducees; especially the first and last points, which are chief in importance and interest. Matt. xxii., Mark xii., Luke xx.

The Sadducees denied the resurrection, and a future existence, and brought the case of the woman having seven husbands, as an insuperable objection to the doctrine; on the mistaken supposition that a future existence necessarily involved a continuation of all the social relations, and legal obligations, of the present. Here, then, were two points in discussion, two errors to be met and refuted—

1. The denial of a future life.

2. The assumption that the conditions of this life would obtain, and be perpetuated, in the next.

These were exactly the first and third questions involved in Paul's argument, and so distinctly unfolded by him — resting, doubtless, upon the foundation of the Saviour's teaching on this subject. Let us then

proceed to examine the method of Christ's treatment of these errors, and the doctrines affirmed by him.

1. "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living — for all live unto him."

The force of this reply rests on the use of the present tense. At the time the language was uttered, these patriarchs had been dead from two to three hundred years, and more; yet God says, "I am the God of Abraham," &c. Now, if they had perished, utterly ceased to exist, there was no propriety or truth in this language; for God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; not the God of nothing, but of something. Since, therefore, he says "I *am* the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," these patriarchs must have been living at the time he spake these words, which was two hundred years after their earthly bodies were dead. There is, therefore, a future existence, another life beyond death.

Dr. Campbell illustrates the point very happily: "If we should hear one man say to another, 'I wish to have you in my service, and to be your master, as I am your father's and your grandfather's master;' should we not conclude that the persons spoken of were alive, and his servants at this very moment? And would it not be reasonable to insist, that if they were not living, his expression would be 'as I *was* your father's and grandfather's master?'"

Thus did our Lord dispose of the first point, and as the Sadducees made no reply, we may conclude they had none to make.

2. The next point was, that the woman had been the wife of seven husbands, "Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her."

As remarked, the mistake of the Sadducees consisted in transferring to the future existence, the relations and conditions of the present existence. This error the Saviour confutes, by a distinct annunciation, that the future life is not like this in its conditions and circumstances; that we are not there as we are here; but changed into the heavenly likeness, and fitted to the character and mode of our new spiritual existence.

"Jesus answered, and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven — neither can they die any more; for they are equals unto the angels, and are children of God, being children of the resurrection."

Observe, there are two specifications made by our Lord: 1. Their ignorance of the Scriptures. 2. Their ignorance of the power of God.

The first refers to their ignorance of the Mosaic record, where God says "I *am* the God of Abraham," &c., and which he quoted in refutation of their denial of a future life. This has already been explained above.

The second refers to their ignorance of the power of God so to change and adapt mankind to the heavenly existence, as to avoid the difficulties they had started regarding the woman with seven husbands.

The Sadducees fell into the common error, common

even in our own time, that there is no change after death, that we carry with us into the future world, the feelings, preferences and characteristics of this world; that what we desire here, we shall desire there; and what we do here, we shall continue to do there.

All this the Saviour positively and plainly denies, and shows that such reasoning is false, that the law of analogy does not hold to this extent; because this life is earthly and that will be heavenly; this life is in a material body, and that will be in a spiritual body. The difference in character and condition, in desires and pursuits, in the elements which go to make up our happiness, will be equally great. In this world we are mortal — in that, we shall die no more. In this world we are men, subject to all the frailties and infirmities of human nature — in that world we shall be as the angels, children of God because we are children of the resurrection. In this world, we are under the influence of the desires, the passions, the love of self, which characterize the flesh — in that we shall be freed from these, and acknowledge the love, the law and dominion of the spirit; the conflict between the flesh and the spirit being forever at an end.

The expression "children of God, being children of the resurrection," has immense weight in it. It is a direct assertion of the fact that the change wrought by the resurrection is moral and spiritual, and transforms the subject of it into the Divine likeness. The phrase "son of" or "children of," is a Hebrew form of speech, signifying, among other things, "in the likeness of," "similar to," "resembling." As ob-

served in a previous note, we have equivalent forms, as a "son of temperance," to designate a temperance man; a "daughter of charity," for a kind and benevolent woman; "sisters of mercy," &c. "Children of light," in the New Testament, are those enlightened by the truth; "children of the evil one," are wicked persons, or those resembling the evil one; "children of God," are godly persons, or those in the likeness of God.

Now the Saviour says that the resurrection works such an entire change in man, so purifies and exalts his soul, lifts him so entirely out of the earthly into the heavenly, that he becomes, by this very anastasis or transformation, a child of God. Of course this establishes the fact that the resurrection has to do with more than the body. It is growth to the soul, enlightenment, instruction, education; and, through these, the lifting it up, leading it up, helping it to rise up, into that spiritual perfection, that "image of the heavenly," reaching which it becomes the child of God in the highest and divinest meaning of the term. We are children of God in this sense, being, or *because* we are children of the resurrection; or in words of the same import, to be in the likeness of the resurrection is to be in the likeness of God.

All the other phraseology is to the same point. The Saviour is explicit and direct beyond mistake, and beyond controversy. The children of the resurrection are "equal unto the angels," they "are as the angels which are in heaven," or "as the angels of God in heaven." Now, these varied forms of expression, are only so many ways of saying that, when the resurrection has completed its work on man, he

becomes angelic. Can anything be more conclusive in evidence of the fact, that the change is a moral and spiritual one? that it is a result brought about by moral and spiritual agencies, through which the soul is corrected, informed and raised up to heaven, and "changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." 2 Cor. iii. 18.[1]

SECTION II.

"EVERY MAN IN HIS OWN ORDER."

The language of Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. 22, is often quoted as proof, that the resurrection state is not a state of holiness and happiness for all. "But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." This is supposed to imply, or teach, that there are two orders in the resurrection beside Christ, the righteous and the wicked; and that the righteous are raised first, and afterwards the wicked.

[1] See the subject continued in the next section. I have made no mention of the words recorded by Luke, "*accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection of the dead*," for two reasons: 1. Because the resurrection of *all* the dead is the acknowledged doctrine of the New Testament. 2. Because the Evangelists could not have attached any great doctrinal importance to the expression, inasmuch as two, out of three recording the conversation, omit it. If it was intended as a declaration of partial resurrection, or of annihilation, or of a difference in the destiny of those raised, they would neither have forgotten it, nor have neglected to report it. What was the precise thought the Saviour may have intended to convey by the words, it is not easy to determine. Perhaps this is the idea,—Those whom God judges worthy of a resurrection, i. e., worth being raised from the dead; those having a mental and moral nature which gives them a title to a future existence—in a word, his intelligent creatures, made in his own image; in distinction from the lower orders of creation.

But this idea conflicts with the common doctrine, that the resurrection of all the dead is simultaneous, "in a moment, at the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." If the dead are all raised in the end of the world, at the same moment, then there is no precedence of the righteous over the wicked, in point of time.

And the position is equally in conflict with the doctrine of a progressive resurrection; for if the resurrection is immediately subsequent to death, then a wicked man dying before a righteous man, is raised before him. And so, on neither hypothesis is the difference of character distinguished by a difference of time in the resurrection.

But in a matter of so much importance, it is not safe to trust to implications; it is not reasonable to suppose the Holy Spirit would leave the truth to be inferred, instead of stating it in plain speech. If, in the resurrection, there are three orders, *First*, Christ; *Second*, The Righteous; and *Third*, The Wicked; why did not Paul, if he was guided by the Spirit of God, say so? That would have put the subject at rest forever. It would have ended all debate and doubt, on the most momentous question in the whole range of divine revelation. If Paul had said, "But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards, they that are Christ's at his coming; and after these the wicked;" then the subject would have been put beyond all controversy. And if it really be so, can we doubt, for a moment, that he would have stated it in this form, or in terms equally positive and definite?

But he has done nothing of the kind. He has not

intimated, much less asserted, that there *are* any wicked in the resurrection. He gives us only two orders: Christ the first fruits; afterwards, they that are Christ's at his coming. If there be any others, he does not mention them; and there is no information in regard to the matter, save what he furnishes.[1]

The order of time is marked, however, by three distinct events, and noting these, will confirm what has already been said. 1. The resurrection of Christ, as the first fruits. 2. The resurrection of those who are Christ's at his coming. 3. "Then cometh the end."

Now, observe, that the "end" comes immediately after the raising of those called Christ's. No transaction, of any kind, intervenes between the second and third event of the series. They are represented as immediately consecutive, following in regular order, according to the original plan. And yet the common doctrine separates these two links in the chain of events, which the argument of Paul has bound together, and inserts another totally foreign, and in direct opposition, to the very purpose of that argument, viz., the resurrection of the wicked! As if it were possible for Paul to forget, or omit, a fact of such tremendous importance; and which, if true, would have compelled an entire re-construction of the argument in this part of his Epistle!

[1]Paul's expression, "*there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust*," is simply expressive of universality, and not of moral character or condition in the resurrection, as he says elsewhere, "Jew and Gentile," "bond and free." We have similar phrases, as "high and low," "rich and poor," "good and bad," "wise and ignorant," meaning thereby "all men." They are used not to describe character but to express universality, completeness.

But the fact of there being only two orders in the resurrection, is farther confirmed by the figure which the apostle employs — "Christ the *first fruits*." The first fruits were gathered, at the beginning of the harvest, and offered in solemn form to God, with great rejoicings, as an acknowledgment of his goodness, and of the bounty of his providence in the fruits of the earth. Afterwards came the general harvest, of which the first fruits were alike a sample and a pledge. Of course, if the figure of the apostle is well chosen, and to the point, there are but two orders in the resurrection; Christ the first fruits, and then the universal harvest of the dead.

This fact of the first fruits being a pattern or sample of the harvest, is important, and still further confirms the argument that there are only two orders. In verse 20, we have the following: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept," or the dead of every condition and character — not of any particular class; for all die alike, and "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Now, if we turn to Rom. xi. 16, we have the argument complete: "If the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches." Here the same figure is used with reference to the final ingathering of the Jews, but the fact asserted is what demands attention, viz., that the first fruits are a specimen, a sample of the quality and character of the whole harvest — "if the first fruits be holy, the lump ("the entire mass, the whole harvest,) is holy." And he repeats the thought under an additional figure: "If the root be holy, so

are the branches; i. e., the branches derive their character from the root out of which they grow; and if the root, therefore, be good, then necessarily the branches must be good also."

The argument of these figures, in their application to the resurrection of the dead, is direct and unanswerable. Christ is the first fruits of the resurrection harvest, and is holy; therefore, we know what will be the quality and character of the universal harvest. He is the root, for in him is all our hope of a future life. We are raised from the mortal into the immortal, from the earthly into the heavenly, through him; as the branches are developed, through the life of the trunk or root, into beauty, and bloom, and fruitage. As the branches are after the nature and pattern of the trunk, so are we, in the resurrection life, after the nature and pattern of Christ. As we have borne the image of the earthy here, so shall we bear the image of the heavenly there; for all shall be made alive in Christ. We may not know now what that image is, but it is enough to know that it is in the likeness of Christ. As John says: "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." 1 John iii. 2.

So the argument stands thus in proof of only two orders or classes in the resurrection:

Christ is the first fruits of all the dead — if the first fruits be holy, the lump, or the whole harvest, is holy — therefore, all the dead in the resurrection will be holy.

If Christ be *not* the first fruits of all the dead, then there is no proof that those, of whom he is not the

first fruits, will be raised at all, and if not raised, then they are perished; and annihilation, and not endless torment, is the result.

These are the only logical conclusions which can be based on the language of the apostle. He is entirely silent in regard to the wicked in the resurrection; and either there are no wicked when "the end" comes, or they are not raised.[1] He speaks of those who are Christ's, but makes not the least allusion to those who are not his; and the legitimate inference is, that there are none of this sort, but that all are Christ's, and Christ is God's; and he, as the Father, is all in all. This is the Christian doctrine, and, as Horne truly says: "How beautiful and striking is Paul's use of this figure of the first fruits, in this most consolatory and closely reasoned chapter, in which he argues and establishes the certainty of the general resurrection, from the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and represents Christ as the first fruits of *a glorious and universal harvest of all the sleeping dead.*"[2]

Yes; and the very point of the argument, and the very truth which gives it its consolatory character, is the fact, that in the resurrection, when the end comes, the wicked will cease to be wicked, and all

[1] Dr. Bloomfield remarks, with great naivete, "The apostle says nothing about those who are *not* Christ's, the *wicked.*" Exactly: and that is good reason why we should say nothing about them. It is not well for us to be wise above what is written in this matter. If the apostle had believed that in the resurrection some would not be Christ's, he could not have forgotten, he would not have refused to say so; and as he did not, the proof is conclusive against such a supposition. For the "resurrection to damnation," and awaking to "everlasting shame and contempt," see chapter x.

[2] Introduction, vol. iii. 288.

souls purified, redeemed, and exalted in Christ, will rejoice for ever more, in the glorious liberty of the children of God. And in confirmation of this view, we shall, in the next section, consider the circumstances under which "the end" here mentioned, is to come, and the time of its coming.

SECTION III.

"THEN COMETH THE END"—CHRIST'S SAVING POWER CONTINUES BEYOND DEATH, TO THE END.

"*Then* cometh the end," says Paul. 1 Cor. xv. 24. When cometh the end? and the end of what? "Then" implies a specified time, and the apostle points it out, with great precision, in the very next words. "*Then* cometh the end, *when* he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; *when* he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." And in the words immediately preceding, he connects the end directly with the resurrection, thus: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. *Then* cometh the end."

The end spoken of, is the end of Christ's mediatorial reign, of his separate kingdom as a Saviour; which, at the time named, he delivers up to God the Father. And this is not done till all things are subjected to his spiritual rule, all opposing powers and authorities; not till death, the last enemy, is destroy

ed, swallowed up in the victory of life immortal (and the *last* enemy implies that all other enemies are destroyed before it, as sin, ignorance, error;) not till all are made alive in Christ; or, in other words, not till the work of the resurrection is completed, and all are raised up into the image of the heavenly, and become children of God, by virtue of this resurrection change.

Then cometh the end of Christ's work as a Saviour, and not till then; *then* cometh the end of his kingdom, and he surrenders all things back into the hands of the Father, and God, henceforth, is all in all. The point to be specially noted and emphasized is, that the end of Christ's saving action and rule, his relation to the soul as Teacher and Redeemer, does not cease at death, but continues till after the resurrection is completed; till the last enemy, till all evil is destroyed.

This once understood, the answer to the question, so often asked, is very plain: "If Jesus came to save all men from sin, and thousands die in sin, thousands die without ever having heard of him, as the heathen; how can he be properly called the Saviour of all?"

The mistake of those who ask this question, is in limiting or restricting the power of Christ, as a Saviour, to this world—in supposing that, at the death of each individual, his redeeming power over the soul ceases. There is nothing in the New Testament to justify this error, and the language of Paul, just quoted, is a direct confutation of it. The power of God over all souls, is infinite and endless, and no event can place them beyond his control. The power which

he has delegated to the Saviour, remains with him till the work he gave him to do is finished; and, certainly, it is not finished in this life in the case of millions of souls dying in unbelief, and ignorance, and sin. Consequently, this power to save, continues beyond death; continues, as Paul says, till "the end" cometh, and this end, as shown, comes *after* the resurrection and the destruction of all evil.

The Resurrection itself, is a part of the Saviour's work, a most important part. Whatever the character of the change it works out for man, it is always ascribed to Christ as the agent of God. Hence we are said to be raised "through Christ," to be "made alive in Christ," to have the victory over death "through our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. This victory God giveth us. It is of his power, as every thing else is; the life that now is, the life to come, the soul itself, salvation, all we have, and all we hope for. But he chooses to bestow his spiritual gifts through Christ. He makes him the medium of communication with us. He delegates his power to him as the Saviour of men, as Jesus himself repeatedly testifies; and one special manifestation of this power is seen in the raising of the dead. "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand;" "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." John iii. 35; vi. 39.

So then the saving power of Jesus over the soul, is not limited to this world, nor is it surrendered at the death of the body. It has no limit but the resurrection in its completeness, and to this grand con-

summation it extends in all its fulness; nay, the resurrection is one of the most glorious exhibitions of this power; for then the sting of death is removed, the victory is plucked from the grave (for death itself is dead); "and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away." Rev. xxi.

If it be asked, "*How* is Christ to save men after death?" the answer is, By the same means, and in the same way, as before death, doubtless; only increased in power and directness, and operating without the obstructions incident to the flesh or earthly nature.

The simple truth is, all men are saved, in a greater or less degree, after death. The spiritual change of the resurrection, is necessary to the completeness and happiness of *every* soul. Are any perfect here? Do not even the best of men fail in many things? Have we not all "come short of the glory of God?" Does not the sainted John declare, that "if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us?" Does not Paul confess, in burning words, to the war between the flesh and the spirit? Is any one on earth, equal to the angels of God in heaven? The answers to these questions are patent to all, and reveal the truth and necessity of a change after death.

We are not perfect, not as the angels, when we die, not even the greatest saint on earth; but we *shall* be in the resurrection. How can this be, if there be no change after death? if Christ do not still aid and bless us as a Saviour? And will Paul main-

tain his painful struggle against evil, and John confess to sin, in the resurrection life? If not, then they will be so far changed after death.[1]

And this position is logically involved in all the creeds of the day. For example, the xxxix Articles of the Episcopal Church, speaking of original sin, say, "This infection of nature doth remain, *yea, in them that are regenerated.*" If then, the regenerate are infected with sin in this world, one of two things is certain; either they continue infected with it after death, or they are saved from it after death.

The Presbyterian Confession of Faith says: "Sanctification is throughout in the whole man, yet imperfect in this life; there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part whence ariseth a continual and irreconcileable war, the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh. The imperfection of sanctification in believers ariseth from the remnants of sin abiding in every part of them, and the perpetual lustings of the flesh against the spirit; whereby they are often assailed with temptations and fall into many sins; are hindered in all their spiritual services, and their best works are imperfect and defiled in the sight of God."

This being the case, if there be no salvation or

[1] "Before death, sin is only repressed—after the resurrection sin will be exterminated. Here the believer has to maintain the combat, with a tendency to evil still lodging in his heart, and working a perverse movement among his inclinations; but after his warfare in this world is accomplished, he will no longer be so thwarted. The great constitutional plague of his nature will no longer trouble him; and there will be the charm of a genial affinity between the purity of his heart and the purity of the element he breathes in." — *Chalmer's Sermon on 2 Peter* iii. 13.

change after death, what is to be done with these believers with "remnants of sin abiding in every part of them?" Are they to continue as "imperfect" in the future life as they are in this life? If not, then they must be saved to that extent beyond this life; and since there is no other Saviour but Christ, they must be saved after death through him. And thus is demonstrated the truth that his redeeming agency does not cease at death, but takes up the soul at its entrance upon the resurrection world, and enlightens, guides and instructs it in divine things, till it attains to that perfection, purity and blessedness, described by the term "heaven," or by the words of Christ "equal unto the angels." And through this resurrection change, this uplifting into the image of God, all must pass alike, differing only in degrees; saint and sinner, believer and unbeliever, Christian and Pagan; those who have learned the name of Christ in this world, and those who never heard of him till they passed over the boundaries into the other world.

And this is "the end" of the work of Jesus — the world redeemed, and clothed in the white robes of purity, every wanderer restored, every fallen one lifted up, and the great family of God renewed in the Divine image in which they were created. To this we all shall come, through Christ and the resurrection. And what a glorious result! with what infinite rejoicings it will be hailed by all the hosts of heaven! "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard

I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Rev. v.

In the eloquent language of Athanase Coquerel, the distinguished Protestant preacher of Paris, and an able advocate of universal restoration: "What an affecting and majestic arrangement of the universe, where there is a place for all; and an immortality where there is an opportunity for all! These thoughts are so delightful and consolatory, that we feel constrained to regard their sublimity as one guaranty more for their truth. And the glory of the Redeemer of the world is compromised by the opposite doctrine, as much as our joy and love. To believe in an eternal hell as well as an eternal heaven, is to bring to the same level the power of evil and falsehood, and that of goodness and truth; it is to deny that virtue has an internal and irresistible force, which eventually will overcome evil; it is to deny that truth ought to outweigh error. I ask, is it administering to the glory of Jesus to say to him: Thy redemption stops for man at the tomb; powerful on this side, it is powerless beyond; it loses itself, so to speak, in the dust of the sepulchre, in the night of death; its efficacy lasts for the duration of human life only; beyond this life, it no longer bears fruit, and has nothing to give. Is it not a much better service to the glory of His mercy to announce new triumphs, and to say to him: "Thou savest ever; thou reignest over the living and the dead; thy redemption retains all its value through immortality; thy reign in heaven at the right hand of God, continues thy mission, in this world; thou intercedest al-

ways with equal power; thou savest always with equal goodness!"[1]

SECTION IV.

DEATH — RESURRECTION — SALVATION — THEIR RELATIONS TO EACH OTHER.

We have already indicated, with sufficient clearness for the intelligent reader, the spiritual character of the agencies and processes by which the soul is to be raised up and redeemed in the resurrection; but there are some special points which, for the sake of the inquirer, may call for farther elucidation and illustration. And it is necessary, in order to meet a supposed difficulty, often stated in the following form:

"A change of place is not a change of character. To suppose that its entrance into the future world will affect the moral tendencies of the soul, or give a new direction to its dispositions, desires and aims, is

[1] "*Le Christianisme Experimental.*" Translated and published in London under the title of "Christianity; its perfect adaptation to the Mental, Moral and Spiritual Nature of Man," 1847. This is Coquerel's great work, the sum of his philosophy, religion, and life experience; the last chapter of which has this title: "The Expectation of Universal Restoration," in which he argues the subject with eminent ability and learning. Later still he has published another work on this subject: "*La Mort Second et les peines eternelles*," or "The Second Death and Eternal Punishment." A single sentence more: "O my brethren," he exclaims, "accept this magnificent hope of the final redemption of all in Christ. To the triumphs of your Divine Saviour, there lacks only the abolition of hell. Do not restrict His reign to the narrow limits of a mortal career. Make room in eternity, and give extension in heaven, to what is infinite in the love of Jesus." It is pleasant to know that the great doctrines of our faith are preached thus eloquently to a congregation of two thousand persons, by one of the most celebrated Protestant Ministers of France — and that, too, in the heart of Paris, a few steps only from the very church whose heavy bell gave the signal for the St. Bartholomew massacre!

as reasonable as to argue that a voyage to India would change the moral character of a man, or make a saint of a sinner. No: the character we form in this life, we carry with us into the other."[1]

This objection proceeds on the ground that the interest of Christ in the soul, his relation to it as a Saviour, ceases with this life; and that in the future world it will be left to itself without guidance, instruction or assistance. But the Saviour, as shown already, never abandons the soul, any more than the shepherd abandoned his sheep when it went from the fold into the wilderness. He follows it in this world,

[1] A comparison of this old school Orthodox and Unitarian philosophy with the following from liberal Orthodoxy, will give us one of the signs of the times:

"There is a strong tendency manifested among men at this time to make the other life an absolute and literal continuation of this. 'Just as a man goes out of this world, just so he begins in the other world,' they say.

If you take a seed that has ripened in Nova Zembla, and bring it into the tropics, and plant it, it will not be what it would have been in Nova Zembla, with a short growing season, and the scantiest supply of food. It will have, with a long summer, and an abundant supply, a growth to which no one would suspect that it could attain, who had only seen it grow in the frigid zones. Many things that are shrubs in the frigid zones, are high, waving century oaks in the tropics. And so men in this life are in conditions which, though fitted to develope the earlier stages of human growth, are not fitted to develop the full estate of that idea which God has expressed in the creation of man. And we may hope that when we bid adieu to our mortal life, we shall leave behind some things which are necessary to the exigencies of our condition here, but which will not be necessary to our state there. Our imagination, our reason, our affections, and our moral sentiments, we shall doubtless carry with us; but the conditions of our life will be so different that we shall be like men taken from poverty into abundance; from winter, into summer; from a cold climate and a frozen soil, into a soil never locked by ice, and skies that never know frost. Our life there shall be ampler, fuller, nobler than it is here."— *H. W. Beecher's Sermon on Death.*

and into all worlds beyond, as a Guide, and Teacher, and Redeemer, till it is found and restored.

But this objection, or the comparison it sets up, fails specially by falsely substituting "place," or the act of passing to it, for "circumstances."

If a voyage to India would have no effect on the character of a man, very likely India itself would. It is not pretended that the mere passage over the sea would effect him morally; but most assuredly he would be affected by the new circumstances and influences which would meet him at his coming; by new associates, and customs, and manners; new estimates of virtue, new principles of action, and views of morality. And how abundantly was this illustrated in the early history of the English East India Company. How completely, in many cases, were the men who first went out to that country, revolutionized in character, principles and morals.

So it is not the mere act of dying, or passing from one world to another, that we regard as affecting that change in the moral condition of the soul, which sets it heavenward, and turns all its impulses and aspirations toward holiness and God. But it is the mighty change in its circumstances, the new and powerful influences by which it will be engirded and acted upon, as soon as it enters upon its new sphere of being.

And when we consider to what extent character in this world is modified by, and dependent on, condition and circumstances; we can scarcely err in giving some weight to this argument.

Look at the wonderful contrasts produced in the Asiatic and European, the African and American, by the influence of geographical position, climate, the

soil and productions of the earth; by modes of life, customs, superstitions, knowledge and social organization. And consider what a tremendous power over the moral nature, over the development of character, the mind and the affections, aims and enjoyments, is had by education and ignorance, plenty and poverty kindness and neglect, virtuous and vicious companions, the presence and absence of temptations. Look into the condition of the destitute and dangerous classes on the one hand, and, on the other hand, into that of those who enjoy all the privileges of mental and moral culture, religion, virtuous society, and a ready and abundant supply for all their physical wants. I am persuaded that any one will feel convinced by the examination, that much of our goodness is due to the favorable circumstances and influences by which we have been surrounded from our birth; and that more wickedness than is generally supposed, is to be put down to hunger, and nakedness, and uncleanness, to bad air, and bad food and shelter, to ignorance and evil associations. The apostle rightly says, "Evil communications corrupt good manners;" and it is equally true that good communications help to reform bad manners.

And can we estimate, then, too highly, the power for good over the soul which will be put in action by the new and wonderful circumstances in which it will be placed on its entrance into the spiritual world, by the mighty and divine influences brought to bear upon it? No longer seeing through a glass darkly, as it did when veiled within the body, it there sees as a spirit, face to face, and perceives the real character and true relations of things. And what sudden rev-

elations of truth, of love, and beauty, burst upon its anointed sight. The glory of God's majesty, the excellency of his wisdom, the extent of his goodness, the tenderness and the love of the Saviour for man, the joy and the spiritual beauty of the angels, the blessedness and ever-increasing knowledge of the redeemed, the boundless creation stretching out on all sides into the invisible, the countless starry worlds that lie like shining dust under the feet of God!

These, and a thousand other exhibitions of divine power and wisdom, and a thousand other revelations of the Saviour's love and grace, and of the holiness and bliss of heaven, must, indeed, exert a mighty attractive influence on the new-born soul, lifting it upward. They will draw it toward the pure, the good, the beautiful, as the vapors of the earth and sea are drawn upward toward the sun, by the attraction of its genial light and warmth.

What force there is even here in truth, and purity, and love. How reverent they will make us, how gentle and yielding, when exerting their full power upon us. How strongly we are drawn toward a really good man, even in this life, while surrounded by all manner of evil influences, and perverted, darkened, and hindered by our sinfulness. O, how much more, then, when the darkness and blindness which the fleshly veil puts upon our sight, are passed away; when, set free from the perverting and corrupting influences of the body, we become spirit only, beholding the infinite goodness of God!

And now let us turn to another thought connected with the subject. It is sometimes said, that a man cannot be made virtuous or holy, as a soiled garment

or vessel is made clean by washing; that the results of conduct are not arrested by some sudden miracle, at death, and the soul separated from its sins, purified and saved, by a kind of moral chemistry, without any effort or volition of its own; that death is wholly a physical result, and has nothing to do with sin, nothing to do with salvation, which is altogether a spiritual result.

It is certainly true that *death* has nothing to do with sin directly, yet the *body* has a great deal to do with it; and as death delivers the soul from the body, it sets it free from the temptations of the body.

Suppose a man falls into the sea encumbered, not only with his ordinary clothes, but with thick, heavy over-garments, his feet encased in heavy boots, and his hands confined in stout gloves. By great exertion and struggle, he succeeds in throwing these off. The getting quit of these, does not, indeed, save him from drowning, but it certainly puts him in a better condition for reaching the shore. So death does not, itself, bestow purity, knowledge, and happiness on the soul, but it certainly puts it in a better condition for reaching these, by freeing it from all the clogs and hindrances of the flesh.

Henry Ward Beecher seems to have caught the true idea: "We shall enter upon another life divested of many of the hindrances and incumbrances of this. When we pass from life, we shall leave behind, not only the body, but all that part of the passions and the appetites which has its function and sphere on account of our poor bodily condition. It seems to me that much that mars life is what we call infirmity; and that when we die, we leave behind us

many things that we call faults, and foibles, and sins, as the trees shed their leaves when winter comes. When the body dies, Oh, how much will perish that is the result of the forces of those passions which sleep with the flesh! When we go from this world, how shall we be released from ten thousand things that belong to our physical state, and that tend to hinder our spiritual development!"[1]

With regard to the observation that "the results of conduct are not arrested by a sudden miracle at death," we may speak more cautiously. As to the miracle, we need not spend words. Experience shows that, without a miracle, the results of conduct, or more properly, what would be the results if that conduct were continued, are often arrested by influences far less potent than death.

Behold the triumphs of Reform in all its phases. Take, as an example, the man who, for years, has given himself up to the most reckless indulgence of appetite, rushing down from one depth of debasement to another, till he becomes degraded as a brute, and ferocious as a fiend. See him now, all at once, sud-

[1] *Independent*, Dec., 1861. CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS said, nearly 1700 years ago: "Souls in their separate state, though darkened by evil passions, have yet a clearer discernment than they had whilst in the body, because they are no longer clouded and encumbered by the flesh." *Stromata*, Lib. vi. cap. 6. The ancient Fathers generally understood the preaching to the spirits in prison, 1 Peter iii., literally; and CLEMENT and ORIGEN both quote the passage in proof of a future universal restoration. ORIGEN believed that the souls of the good, or Christians, at death, go to Paradise, or the bosom of Abraham; and that, as they grow in knowledge, they rise to higher and higher regions, till they finally reach that state of perfection and blessedness called Heaven. GREGORY NAZIANZEN, and others, believed they went directly into the presence of God.— *Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, Sects.* 77, 78, 142.

den as the flash of the lightning, arrested in his course! A look, or a tone of the voice, a dream, a beautiful memory, the prayer of his childhood, the vision of his dead mother's sweet forgiving look, the remembrance of a sister's love, the face of a child, a strain of music, turns back the whole tide of his being; and the steps that were just now going downward to hell, are turned upward toward heaven!

And if such slight incidents can so suddenly arrest the sinful and criminal, and turn the whole current of thought, and feeling, and purpose, into a new and right direction; can death, which liberates the soul from the body and its temptations, be powerless in its influence? Is it presumption to suppose that this great event, which changes the condition, and all the outward relations of the spirit, and opens for it a new era of existence, will arrest its evil tendencies, and exert a mighty moral influence upon it? I think a just and intelligent philosophy would predict precisely such a result on inductive principles.

And let us not be deceived by any false ideas of forcing the soul into the right, or violating the laws of its spiritual constitution, by turning it to God. The new influences acting upon it in the resurrection, may affect it more powerfully, and more quickly impart to its desires and affections, a right direction, than while in association with the body; but it will be in perfect accord with the nature of the soul, with the laws of its being, and with its volition and freedom. We believe in no violation, or forcible suspension of these. Jesus will work out the redemption of the soul in the resurrection, by the same agencies which he employs here. He will not save

by "mechanical" forces or means, but by such means as shall address themselves to the natural conditions and elements of the spiritual being.

The growth of a plant may be hastened by an increase of light and heat, or by a more favorable location, or fitting soil. And the same result may be obtained by a peculiar dressing of the soil, or by an increase of electricity supplied to the earth and plant. But all this is in perfect harmony with the radical nature and laws of the plant; nay, could not be at all, if it were not so. Whatever sudden increase of growth or productiveness is attained, is the consequence of more favorable circumstances adapted to the existing capacities, structure, and wants of the plant.

So with the soul, in the resurrection. It is brought into more favorable circumstances, and its growth is more rapidly set forward by a great and sudden increase of spiritual light and heat; but in perfect harmony with its nature, the laws of its structure and development, and the capacities with which it was originally endowed. The germ of all the soul will attain to, and enjoy, in the future life, is doubtless within it now and here. The more genial clime of the spirit world will only quicken and develop it.

There is a pleasant passage from Mountford, illustrating this truth: "Look out of the window, at the garden. It is very beautiful. But what was it last Christmas, when barrenness, and cold, and death, reigned every where, over garden, and field, and forest? And yet nearly all you now behold was at that time existent under the soil. There lay latent in the

hard black clods of earth, all the gracefulness of those plants, the shady foliage of the trees, every flowery perfume, the lusciousness of the grape and the strawberry; and all the colors of the rainbow, those of the rose, the polyanthus, the daffodil, the daisy, the violet, and the acanthus, together with all the sweetness and the attractiveness of the whole scene. Three months sunshine and rain have fostered, out of dead earth, all this beauty and abundance! But rain and sunshine, what are they, as agents compared with holy influences like those which the Father Almighty can exert upon the soul of man!"

Need we, then, when we see these wonders of renewal, in the natural world, wrought out by such simple agencies, need we doubt the final restoration of the soul to God? *Can* we doubt his resources, his power to renew it again in its first love, in the glory of its primeval state? Can we imagine a beauty of holiness, an excess of bliss, too great for the resurrection state? too great for the soul's glad summer to realize?

And when we see the simplicity of method and means by which God works in the natural world, and freshens the earth into beauty and abundance; shall we suffer any vain and blind philosophy to deceive us with the idle assertion that this doctrine makes the resurrection only a kind of moral chemistry, and the salvation of the soul a deliverance and purification as by miracle? In the presence of the great restoration of Nature in her spring-time, does a like renewal in the spiritual world, look impossible or unphilosophical? I do not say "unscriptural," because, as we have seen, the Gospel authoritatively announces

this glorious consummation as the eternal purpose of God, and the end, and the crowning triumph, of Christ's mission.

In the preceding chapters, we have presented the leading doctrines of the Theology of Universalism, in their natural and consequential relations. We have endeavored to show how they link into each other, and unite in a complete system; beginning in the original purpose and plan of God, embracing the argument from the Divine character and perfections, the object of the Saviour's mission, the nature of his Redemption, the office of the Holy Spirit, the New Birth of the soul, the glory and blessedness of the Immortal Life; and ending in the final restoration and exaltation to this life of all mankind through Jesus Christ.

These doctrines are coincident with the entire drift of Divine Revelation; they constitute the substance and meaning of the Gospel, and alone give to the mission of the Son of God, its true dignity and value. In themselves, they are a system of Divinity. They complete the argument in relation to human destiny, and the ultimate results of the government of God on earth; and establish the ever-blessed and beautiful truth, that the good of Man and the glory of God are one and inseparable.

But in conducting the inquiry thus far, we have avoided all side issues, all discussions of collateral doctrines, for the express purpose of carrying the argument forward, without interruption, from its starting point in the primal purpose of God, to its logical conclusion in the final restoration and perfection of

mankind. Consequently, we have omitted all polemical reference, not absolutely in the line of reasoning pursued, to the doctrines of Judgment, of Rewards and Punishments specially as such, of Repentance and Forgiveness, the Divine Law and its Penalties, Damnation, Everlasting Punishment, Hell, &c.; reserving them for separate consideration, as collateral proofs, and illustrations of the main argument.

These subjects, which embrace a wide range of inquiry, and exposition, will receive attention in the chapters which follow. And the reader will not only find that the teachings of the Bible on these points, do not contravene the argument of the preceding chapters; but as intimated, it will be a pleasing surprise to him, if he has not investigated the subject before, to find how perfectly they harmonize with, and how thoroughly they confirm, the crowning doctrine of Universal Redemption. This will especially appear in the several expositions of the doctrines concerning Judgment, the Divine Law, Rewards and Punishments, &c. They will discover the manner in which all these great facts and principles of the Divine Government, converge upon the single point of the final abolition of all sin and suffering, and the everlasting reign of holiness and happiness throughout the universe. And at the close of the investigation, he will, perhaps, take up the saying of the ancient people, with a larger and more glorious meaning: "The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King; he will save us." Isa. xxxiii.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT.

The word Judgment is used with a variety of significations in the sacred writings.

1. As descriptive of the *Laws* or *Commandments* of God to the Jews. After statutes and laws were given to the people, Moses said to them: "Wherefore, it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these *judgments*, and keep, and do them," &c. Deut. vii.

2. As descriptive of *Punishment*. "My sword shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse to *judgment*." Isaiah xxxiv.

3. For *Justice*. "There is no *judgment* in their goings." Isa. lix. "Ye pay tithes of annis, cummin and mint, but have omitted the weightier matters of the Law, *judgment*, mercy, and faith." Matt. xxiii. "Princes shall rule in *judgment*." Isaiah xxxii.

4. As descriptive of *Government*, or *Rule* over a people. "Then all the elders of Israel came to Samuel, and said unto him, Behold, thou art old, now make us a *king to judge* us like all the nations." 1 Sam. viii. "Sampon *judged* Israel twenty years." And Paul said to Felix (Acts xxiv. 10,) "Forasmuch as thou has been of many years, *a judge of this nation*," &c. Felix was governor of the Jews. In the same sense we find it used in Psalm lxvii. 4, applied to Jehovah. "O let the nations be glad, and

sing for joy! For thou shalt judge the people righteously, and govern the nations upon the earth."

We shall proceed to consider first, the subject of this quotation — God judging the earth.

SECTION I.

GOD JUDGING THE WORLD UNDER THE OLD DISPENSATION.

Under the Old Dispensation, God is represented as judging the earth, or mankind, in this sense; as ruling and governing the world, rewarding and punishing, and possessing and exercising all the powers appertaining to a sovereign or ruler of a people. He is judging every day, continually employing his authority in encouraging the virtuous and obedient, and punishing the vicious and rebellious, all with the design of promoting the highest usefulness and happiness of those who are thus judged or governed.

"Thou satest in the throne judging right. The Lord shall endure for ever: he hath prepared his throne for judgment. And he shall judge the world in righteousness, he shall minister judgment to the people in uprightness. The Lord also will be a refuge for the oppressed, a refuge in times of trouble." Psalm ix. 2–10. The use of the words "govern," "reign," "throne," &c., show that the term "judgment" is the synonym of "government."

Numerous are the passages which illustrate this important fact; such as Genesis xviii.: "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Psalm lviii.: "Verily there is a reward for the righteous; verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth." Jeremiah ix.: "I am the Lord which exercise loving kindness,

judgment and righteousness in the earth." Psalm xcvi. 10–13: "Say among the heathen that the Lord reigneth: the world also shall be established, that it shall not be moved: he shall judge the people righteously. Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof; let the field be joyful, and all that is therein. Then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth; he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth."

These passages show very conclusively that, under the old dispensation, and in the Old Testament Scriptures, God is set forth as the Judge or Ruler of the world, — exercising his authority continually, rewarding the righteous and punishing the wicked, *here on the earth.* Let us look at some examples showing the manner in which the Divine Sovereign ruled and judged the world from day to day.

I. *Prior to the giving of the Law.*

I cannot go into particulars; nor is it needful, since all readers of the Bible are familiar with the cases. The blessings and rewards of obedience are illustrated in the lives of *Abraham*, *Noah*, *Lot*, &c. These were encouraged by the direct results of faith and virtue; and all men seeing the divine favor manifested toward them, were encouraged to follow in their steps.

On the other hand, the judgment of punishment is exhibited in the case of *Cain*, the *Antediluvians*, *Sodom*, &c. These show that God was a judge in the earth; and such patent and visible retributions of Providence acted as warnings to the rude people of

those ages, who must *see* the wicked punished; who could better appreciate these than the subtle retributions of conscience and the inner life, which went on out of sight of the world.

II. *Under the Law.*

The history of the Jews is a perfect commentary on the doctrine that God judgeth in the earth. This people enjoyed great favors when obedient, and were punished when disobedient; and their annals furnish abundant evidence of the manner and nature of the divine judgment under the Law, showing that "the righteous *are* recompensed in the earth," also "the wicked and the sinner." Prov. xi. The whole matter is set out in detail in Deuteronomy xxviii. 1–9, 58–69.

Thus it is proved that, in the words of Paul, "*every transgression* and disobedience *received a just recompense of reward*," Heb. ii. 2; or as Jehovah himself expresses it, "According to their way and doings I *judged* them,"—*past time.* Ezekiel xxxvi. 19.

III. *The Heathen.* These were governed or judged by the unwritten *law of conscience*, as seen in the Epistle to the Romans ii. 14, 15: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing, or else excusing one another."

Psalms vii. 11, seems to cover the whole ground "God judgeth the righteous, and God is angry with the wicked every day"—i. e., every day he judges the righteous and the wicked, rewarding the one, and punishing the other.

Such was the state of things previous to the coming of Christ, the Son and Representative of God. God, so to speak, judged the world directly by the law of knowledge and truth given. But when Christ entered on his mission, a new order of things began — new revelations were given, and a new kingdom set up.

Jesus was sent as a spiritual king and judge in the place of God, for a time, for a specific purpose. Hence he says, "All power is given me in heaven and in earth." Matt. xxviii. 18. And again, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father." John v. 22.

From this it is seen that, on and after the establishment of the gospel kingdom, Jesus is recognized as King, Judge or Ruler of the world; and hence he says, "For judgment I am come into this world," (John ix. 39) — i. e., to rule and govern the world by the laws and principles of the gospel, rewarding and punishing, encouraging and correcting, till all shall be brought into obedience to truth and holiness.

In concluding this part of the inquiry, it may be well to note, that the fact of God's judging the world is regarded by the Scripture writers not as a matter of terror, but of rejoicing, as in Psalm xcvi. This is important; as generally it is considered a reason for fear. David, who had suffered from the judging of God, exclaims, "Thy judgments are right, and thou in faithfulness hast afflicted me." Psalm cxix. 75. Again: "Unto thee, O Lord, belongeth *mercy*, for thou renderest to every man according to his work." Psalm lxii. 12. This is a remarkable passage. The

Psalmist ascribes *mercy* to God, *because* he judges every man according to his works, the righteous and the wicked! How different these views of David respecting the coming of God to judgment with every man, compared with the views entertained by most Christians on the same subject. While they preach terror, he calls upon all the world to rejoice.

This mingling of severity and goodness should fill us with confidence in the beneficent issues of all his judgments; and the promise of the after peaceable fruits of righteousness, should fill us with gratitude toward him who, even in his punishments, seeks our eternal welfare.

Nothing is more important than right faith and right feeling on this point. Nothing will contribute so much toward that spirit of reverent obedience, that tender affection and child-like trust toward God, which it is the aim of the Gospel to inculcate in every human heart. Never let us sink the Father in the Judge or the Lawgiver. Never let us forget that in all he does, God seeks our good; and so we shall be the more likely in all we do to seek his glory.

And we must keep in mind, also, that under the new dispensation, as well as under the old, all power resides in God; and that though now Christ judges the world, he judges by virtue of authority given him of the Father, and administers the government according to the principles laid down by the Father. Hence He says: "I can of mine own self do nothing. As I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." John v. 30.

SECTION II.

CHRIST JUDGES THE WORLD UNDER THE NEW DISPENSATION.

In the previous section we considered the Scriptural doctrine of Judgment, as significant of rule or government, including the administration of rewards and punishments; ending with the announcement of the important fact of the appointment of Christ, the Son of God, as Judge or Ruler of the world under the new or gospel dispensation.

We have seen the great truth fully established by Scripture, that God judged the world every day, rewarding the righteous and punishing the wicked.

Of course, if the world under Christ or the gospel is to be governed or judged according to a new set of laws or principles, we shall be notified of this in the outset. If, instead of ruling or judging by present rewards and penalties, the whole matter is to be postponed to the end of the material world, or of Christ's reign, we shall certainly be told of so important a change, in the very opening of the new order of things.

This, however, is not done: there is not a word in relation to it! If such a momentous revolution took place, we are not informed of it.

Now, suppose a king or governor should suddenly change the whole order of proceedings in regard to criminal matters; the laws, penalties, the time and place of trial and punishment, and the entire constitution of government itself; — suppose, instead of protecting life and property, and securing the rights and safety of virtuous and peaceful citizens, and punishing law-breakers and criminals immediately on com-

mission of the offense, he should leave every kind of crime and wickedness to go unpunished, and excuse himself by saying that he had appointed a day at the end of twenty years for adjusting all these matters, rewarding the good and punishing the bad! Suppose this; and not to say anything of the absurdity and folly and injustice of such a government, would he not be bound morally, and by every consideration of equity and honor, to notify his subjects of so great and vital a change? *Yes*, is the universal answer. But neither God, nor Christ, give any notice of such a change as this. God nowhere announces that, having for 4000 years tried the plan of continuous rewards and punishments, and found it a failure, henceforth he will leave every one to do as he pleases, till the end of the world. The Scripture is wholly silent in regard to such a sudden and mighty contrast between the Old and New Dispensations! This could not be, if such a change in the spiritual government or judging of the world had taken place under Christ. And there can be no stronger presumptive proof possible against the common church doctrine, than this entire silence on the part of God just at the time when, of all others, we have every reason to suppose he would have spoken in the most distinct and positive manner.

Let us now turn to some of the more important particulars of this judgment of the world by Christ.

§ I. *The time and place of Christ's judgment — when the judgment day began.*

We must not forget the true import of the term "judgment," — namely, that of rule or government, sometimes rewarding and sometimes punishing, ac-

ording to the conduct of the subject. Felix was the judge or governor of the Jews, and Samson judged or ruled Israel twenty years. So Christ judges the world, ruling according to the laws of the spiritual kingdom which the Father gave him.

And now, when did this judgment begin? The following testimony will show: "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came in the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and *a kingdom*, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion, is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" Dan. vii. 13, 14.

Here we see the inauguration of the Son of man as the spiritual Ruler of the world, and the nature of the dominion given into his hands by the Ancient of days. And this, of course, took place at the time of the abolition of the Old Dispensation, respecting which we are abundantly certified that it was accomplished when the city and temple were destroyed, the daily sacrifice taken away, and the Jewish State and Church utterly abolished and disowned of God. Professor Bush, a well-known and distinguished Biblical scholar and critic, says: —

"We deem the evidence decisive, that this economy of 'judgment' was to commence synchronically with that predicted 'coming' of Christ which is so splendidly set forth in the vision of Daniel, where the Son of man receives his kingdom from the Ancient of days. But let it be borne in mind that this 'coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven," an-

nounced by Daniel, is *precisely the same coming* with that announced by our Saviour in the Gospels, especially Matt. xvi. 27, 28: 'for the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. 'Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." So again, Matt. xxiv. 34: 'Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.' So also, Matt. x. 23: 'Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come.'

We hold it to be utterly impossible, upon fair canons of interpretation, to divorce these predictions of Daniel and of Christ from a joint reference to one and the same coming, and that, too, a coming that was to be realized *in its incipient stages* at the destruction of Jerusalem. We are satisfied, indeed, that that event did not *exhaust* the import of this pregnant prophecy. We doubt not that it embraces a grand series of events—a dispensation, in fine—extending through the lapse of hundreds of years, down to the period when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. But the *commencement* of this train of occurrences is to be dated from the destruction of Jerusalem. Then it was that the 'great judgment' commenced, because then the 'kingdom of the Messiah' took its *open* and *manifested* rise."[1]

[1] Bush on the "Resurrection," p. 285. Lee, in his late work on 'Eschatology," takes the same view: "He begins the work of judgment when he receives his kingdom." p. 124.

Here, then, we have an important point established, viz: that the judgment day of Christ began with the opening of his kingdom. And one of the first and most momentous displays of his authority is exhibited in the punishment of the Jews and the enemies of the truth, as set forth in the parable of the sheep and goats; at the same time bestowing the reward of life and peace on his faithful disciples.

This was the opening scene of Christ's kingdom, of his judgment or government of the world; and this judgment has been going on from that day to this, progressive, continual, and it will go on till he surrenders back again to God the kingdom and power which he received from him. It is in this fact — that the gospel day, or the period of Christ's reign, is the judgment day in which every one is rewarded according to what he does, whether good or bad — that we find the key to many important passages.

Paul says, Rom. vi. 23: "The wages of sin is death." "Wages" signifies the "daily pay" of a Roman soldier. This is the literal meaning of the Greek word. So the sinner is represented as receiving daily his pay for the evil he does — not as reprieved to end of life, and then receiving it all at once.

To this point also is Acts xvii. 30, 31: "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained," &c. "The verb *estesen* does not signify appoint with reference to the future, but establish at present. So that the text does not assert that God has appointed a future day when he will judge the world, but that he has constituted or established a

court at which he is *now* ready to judge the world by Jesus Christ — 'all nations' (Matt. xxv. 32.) And this is given as a reason why God *now* commandeth all men everywhere to repent." [1]

The day referred to is the gospel day of judgment, the time of Christ's government on earth: "a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice *in the earth.*" Jer. xxiii. 5. The word "day" is often used to designate the period of Christ's rule, as in Isaiah xi. 6–9: "And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might — and with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth — and the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, &c., for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord — and *in that day* there shall be a root of Jesse, to it shall the Gentiles seek." And so in chapter xxv., after that beautiful description of the gospel judgment or rule ending with the words, "and the Lord God will wipe away tears from all faces," then follows this: "And *in that day*, it shall be said, 'Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us.'"

These are beautiful descriptions of the *day* in which Christ shall reign and execute judgment in the earth; that glorious era of which the Saviour speaks: "Abraham rejoiced to see *my day*, and saw it, (with the eye of faith,) and was glad." John viii. 56.

And in view of these facts, what new significance attaches to the words which he uttered when he entered on his appointed mission — "*Now* is the judg-

[1] Lee's "Eschatology," p. 128.

ment of this world; *now* is the prince of this world cast out," (John xii.)—i. e., error and sin (represented under the figure of a Prince ruling the world,) are now to be cast out by the power and truth of the gospel, and the judgment or reign of righteousness is to begin, under the Prince of Peace, whom God hath appointed to rule the world in equity.

Accordingly, we find Peter (Acts x. 42) affirming that he and his fellow disciples were "commanded to preach unto the people, and testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be Judge of the quick and dead"—i. e., those quickened into spiritual life by the truth, and those still dead in trespasses and sins. And as to the time, he is very explicit in his first Epistle, (iv. 5,) where he speaks of the disobedient and wicked "who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead." *Ready*, 1800 years ago! And this was written a few years only before that opening scene described in Matt. xxv—when, the old dispensation abolished, the judgment or government of the new dispensation commenced under the Lord Christ.

After what has been said thus far, respecting the *time* of the judgment by Christ, involving as it does the nature of it, nothing is needed in regard to the *where* or *place* of the judgment. Still, a few testimonies may be put in here to confirm the argument of time.

We saw that under the old dispensation God is declared to be a God that judgeth in the earth. Now we may repeat of the *place*, what was said of the general principles involved in the divine administration of justice. If the place of judgment or rule was to

be, under the new dispensation, transferred from this world to another, surely we should be informed of it in the clearest terms in the very beginning of the new order of things. But here, also, profound and perfect silence is maintained — not a word in regard to it. The fair conclusion from this is, that no change was inaugurated. And the nature of the judgment demonstrates this, as well as direct testimony.

The passage once before cited, is to this point: "Behold the days shall come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice *in the earth.*" Jer. xxiii. 5. So Isaiah xlii. 1–4: "Behold mine elect. I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles (or the nations). He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment *in the earth*, and the isles shall wait for his law." And the Saviour distinctly says: "For judgment I am come into *this* world." John ix. 39.

And this is the thing which needs to be believed of all men, and to act on their daily life, viz: that the judgment of Christ is present, continuous, and ever operative. It is not confined to one event, as the destruction of Jerusalem; but extends through the entire gospel day, rewarding and punishing every man according to his works, until the kingdom is returned to God.

Every joy of the good man, the approval of conscience, the security of obedience, the strength of prayer, the peace of virtue, the triumph of faith, the

fellowship of the Holy Spirit, on the one hand, — and, on the other, every woe of the wicked, the pangs of conscience, the sting of remorse, the agony of fear, the perpetual unrest of guilt, and every form of evil consequent on sin, is, each in itself, a proof that now is the judgment of this world; that this present time is the judgment day of Christ, "the day," declared of Paul (Rom. ii. 16) "when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, *according to the gospel.*"

And this point the reader will find abundantly illustrated and confirmed, in the chapter on the Rewards of Righteousness, and the Punishments of Sin, which follows this. He will see how the moral and spiritual constitution is constructed of God, with express reference to this continuous judgment of "the secrets of men;" so that nothing hidden from the world, whether good or evil, can fail of its just recompense before the universal judge. He will discover the all-important truth that man carries in his own soul, his heaven or his hell, accordingly as he is faithful or unfaithful, righteous or wicked.

And this brings us to the question which naturally finds place here, which the preceding facts suggest to every inquiring mind: *How* does Christ judge the world in accordance with the views set forth in this argument? Is the judgment spiritual, or literal and personal? Taking the Scriptures as guide, we will endeavor to answer this in what follows.

§ II. *The judgment is spiritual, and not literal; or, in other words, it is by the truth, by the Gospel, and not in person.*

That this is the case, is evident alike from the na-

ture of the judgment, and from his own words. The judgment day, as we have seen, is the time of the gospel reign on earth, yet Christ is not here in person. "*Now* is the judgment of this world," he says, and yet we know he is not in this world personally.

It is through the power of his doctrines, and his divine life, that he is judging or ruling the world, approving the good, and condemning the bad — *not by personal judgment.*

But his own testimony will settle this question to the satisfaction of all: "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." See John xii. 46–50.

That is, not in person, of my own authority, but by that word of truth and righteousness, that gospel of salvation, which I received of the Father. This is the spiritual law and power by which every man will be judged in the last day; i. e. the gospel day.

The "last day" is applied to the gospel day, because the Christian dispensation is final, to be succeeded by no other in the judgment or government of the world; because in it the purpose and plan of salvation is completed.

In this judgment day of the gospel, all are to appear at the bar of truth, and, tried by the word of God and Christ, to be dealt with according to their actions, and the character of their lives. Paul says: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *done* in

his body, according to that he hath done, whether *it be* good or bad." 2 Cor. v. 10. Observe, carefully, that the passage says we are to receive *both* for the *good* we do, and for the *bad*, when we appear at the judgment seat of Christ; but do those who believe in a future general judgment, believe also that, at that time, Paul is to receive for his *evil*, as well as his good; for his persecutions, as well as his missionary labors? And are sinners also to receive for their good, as well as their bad? for all do some good, and many of them do a great deal in the years of a life time.

Now, while the doctrine of a future general judgment denies this manifest teaching of the passage, the view of judgment we present, provides for the very thing here asserted, viz: that *every one*, saint and sinner, shall receive for *both* the good and bad done. And daily observation confirms the truth of this position. Good men sometimes do wrong, and suffer; while bad men sometimes do good, and are rewarded for it.

The expression "judgment seat," is figurative; just as we often say "the bar of public opinion," or "the judgment seat of conscience." That it is in this world, is evident; for the prophet distinctly says, he "shall execute justice and judgment *in the earth*." Jer. xxiii. Of course, the "judgment seat" is where he executes judgment—in the earth. [1]

[1] The exposition given above will be confirmed by reading the passage without the words in *italics*, which are not the words of Paul, but of our translators, who supplied them to make out what *they* thought the sense of the passage. Leaving them out, the verse reads thus: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things in body, according to that which he hath done,

In this spiritual judgment of the world by his truth or the gospel, the Saviour speaks of his disciples as being associated with him: "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration, (i. e. the work of regenerating or renewing the world by his truth,) when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, (i. e. enter on his government after the abolition of the Law dispensation,) ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." "By the apostles sitting on thrones judging the tribes," says M'Knight, "may be understood their ruling the Christian church by the laws of the gospel, which the Master inspired them to preach." What Christ says, therefore, by this passage is, that as they preached his truth, so they should be associated with him in the government or judgment of the world by that truth.

Correspondent to this, the prophet Daniel (vii. 21, 22,) says: "The Ancient of Days came, and judgment (rule) was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints *possessed the kingdom.*"

So Paul says (1 Cor. vi. 1,) "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?" i. e. direct, regulate, govern, by the justice and holiness of their lives, and by the wisdom of their teaching and doctrine. So all good men reign with Christ, judging the world, its good and its evil; encouraging and approving the one, and condemning and rebuking the other.

whether good or bad." This makes quite a different thing of it, and illustrates the very argument in hand, by declaring that we must receive *in the body* for the good and evil we have done; not that we must receive *out of the body*, for the things that we have done *in* the body.

I come now in conclusion, to speak of what, perhaps, may be regarded as the most important feature of our inquiry, viz:

§ III. *The End and Results of Christ's judgment of the world.*

The day of judgment began with, and is the day of, Christ's mediatorial reign; and it will end when that reign is finished, and the kingdom delivered up to the Supreme and Universal Sovereign and Lord.

The result of this judgment, or reign of Christ, will be revealed in the final destruction of all error and sin, and of every evil thing; in the restoration of all intelligences to God, and the universal prevalence of spiritual harmony, love, and holiness. This is the grand consummation, when Christ "shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied."

To this prophets and apostles continually allude; and of this glorious issue, Gospels, and Epistles, and Apocalypse, make mention in glowing phrase, in words of beauty and of power. A few citations will show this.

The Saviour himself has, with singular felicity, associated this judgment of the world and its results, in one sentence. "Now, is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out: and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death he should die." John xii. 32, 33. Here the connection and dependence of the two facts or truths, is perfect. Christ says, that *now* he will judge or govern the world by his truth and grace; and so govern it as to cast out the spirit of disobedience and sin, which, as a prince or despot, rules in the hearts

of men; and finally through the power of his death on the cross, the power of his atoning love, *draw* ALL MEN unto him! Such, he declares, is to be the result of his judgment, his spiritual rule — the reconciliation of all souls through him, to God! Glorious, indeed.

To the same end is the witness of Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. 24–28. "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed, is death, ... then shall the Son also himself be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." Thus we see that Christ is to judge or rule the world, until every enemy of man, even to the last, which is death, is destroyed. Then shall all souls, subdued to the Saviour by the power of his truth and love, brought into harmony with his law and his spirit, acknowledge him as Lord and Redeemer. And when this is accomplished, then, no longer retaining his authority since the saving purpose, for which he received it, is complete, he surrenders the kingdom back again into the hands of the Father, and God is all in all!

It is very pleasing and instructive to note how perfectly the Ancient Universalist Fathers agree with us of to day, in their interpretation of this and other important passages declarative of this sublime conclusion of the Saviour's reign. The following, on the above text, (1 Cor. xv. 22–28,) will illustrate this. It is from Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa (A. D. 364): "What, therefore, is the scope of St. Paul's dissertation in this place? That the nature of evil shall at length be wholly exterminated, and divine, immortal goodness embrace within itself every rational crea-

ture; so that of all who were made by God, not one shall be excluded from his kingdom. All the viciousness, that like a corrupt matter is mingled in things, shall be dissolved and consumed in the furnace of purgatorial fire; and everything that hath its origin from God, shall be restored to its pristine state of purity. .... When, therefore, the dominion of sin within us shall be entirely overthrown, every thing must, of course, be subject to him who rules over all; because there can be no opposing inclination in the universe. Now subjection to God is perfect and absolute alienation from evil. Wherefore, when we all shall be freed from sin, and perfectly assimilated to Christ, our first fruits, and made one uniform body with him, then what is called the subjection of Christ is, in reality, accomplished in us; and because we are his body, our subjection is attributed to him who effected it in ourselves. It is manifest that here the apostle declares *the extinction of all sin*, saying that God will be all in all. For God will be truly all in all, *only when no evil shall remain in the nature of things.*"

Origen (A. D. 230,) says, on the same passage: "What, then, is that subjection with which *all* things must be subdued to Christ? I think it to be that with which we ourselves desire to be subdued to him; and with which the apostles, and all the saints who have followed Christ, have been subdued to him. For the very expression, *subjected to Christ*, denotes the salvation of those who are subjected; as David says: 'Shall not my soul be subjected to God? for from him is my salvation.' Ps. lxii. 1. So the great variety of characters, and different orders of beings

which now exist, will, through the goodness of God, their subjection to Jesus Christ, and the unity of the Holy Spirit, be finally restored to one and the same state."[1]

And it is this view of subjection which enables us to see the force of the declaration: "Wherefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus *every knee should bow*, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; *and every tongue confess* that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii. 9–11.

What a witness this, to the beneficent and blissful results of the Saviour's judgment of the world by the word of his truth, and the spirit of his righteousness. How should all men rejoice that Jesus is our Judge, our Ruler, our Prince; that we are subject to his authority, and that finally, with songs of gratitude and praise, we shall be subject to his law of holiness.

SECTION III.

THE JUDGMENT AFTER DEATH.

The object of the apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is to show the superiority of Christ and the Gospel, over Aaron and the Law. See chapters viii. and ix. 11–14.

In these passages, and in many others, the apostle shows the law was only the shadow of good things to come; and that its sacrifices, which were only for

[1] *Tract. in dictum Apostoli*, "*Tunc etiam ipse Filius subjiceretur*," *&c.*; and ORIGEN's *De Principiis*, Lib. i. cap. 6.

a time, were set aside by the great offering of the Universal Redeemer.

The passage in review (ix. 27, 28,) furnishes one of the illustrations or arguments on this head: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

1. *What Men?* This is usually quoted "all men;" but it is not *all* men, but *particular* men, of whom the apostle is speaking. Very strangely, if it was unintentional, our translators have left untranslated, the particularizing or demonstrative word in the Greek, though elsewhere they have rendered it into English. The same word occurs in chapter vii. 27, and is translated "those;" "who needeth not daily, as *those* high priests, to offer up sacrifice."

Now, if we translate the same word in the same way, in the passage in hand, it puts a new face upon it at once, and points directly to its true interpretation. We should then have it thus: "As it is appointed unto THOSE men once to die," &c. Now then, the question comes up at once, What men? The same, of course, that he has been talking about all along. The word "those" points to men already mentioned, the very men named in the passage just quoted from chapter vii. — "those high priests" who daily offered up sacrifices; and in ix. 6, 7, 25–28, where "the *high priest* entered into the holy place every year." Plainly, the reference is not to *all* men, but to *those* men who are appointed to die in the sacrifices, "with the blood of others" for the sins of the people,

"every year." This brings us to the next point of comparison, which will abundantly confirm this position.

2. *What death?* "*As* it is appointed — *so* Christ was once offered." The comparison here is generally overlooked, and yet the little words "as" and "so," are the key of the passage. Surely, *all* men are not appointed to die as Christ died, *a sacrifice for sin*, to put away sin. But the men here named, *did* die in the same manner, or for the same purpose, that Christ died — they to put away the sin of the Jewish nation, and he to put away the sin of the world. And thus *as* these high priests died, *so* Christ was once offered to bear the sin of many. *See verses* 7, 25, *&c.*

The superiority of Christ, which is the point of the argument, is shown in the following particulars:

1. The high priest sacrificed, or died, by the blood of bulls and goats; but Christ by his *own* blood — one figurative, the other real.

2. The high priest died every year; Christ once for all.

3. The high priest died for one nation; Christ died for all nations.

Thus was demonstrated the superiority of Jesus, the high priest of the world, over the high priest of the Jews, by three plain and conclusive arguments.

3. *What Judgment?* "*After this the Judgment.*" It was appointed to the high priest to die sacrificially for the sins of the people, and after this came the judgment. This sacrifice was made every year, on the great day of Atonement. Of this let us read from Leviticus xvi. 29–34. "And this shall be a

statute for ever unto you: that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and do no work at all, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourneth among you: For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord. And the priest whom he shall anoint, shall put on the linen clothes, even the holy garments: And he shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar: and he shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation. And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year. And he did as the Lord commanded Moses."

Observe, the priest is to put on "*the holy garments.*" What are these? Let us read from Exodus xxviii. 4, 15, 17, 21, 29, 30. "And these are the garments which they shall make; a breast-plate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a broidered coat, a mitre, and a girdle: and they shall make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, and his sons, that he may minister unto men in the priest's office. And thou shalt make *the breast-plate of judgment;* and Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel in the breast-plate of judgment upon his heart, when he goeth in unto the holy place, for a memorial before the Lord continually. And thou shalt put in the breast plate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim; and they shall be upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth in before the Lord; *and Aaron shall bear the judg-*

ment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually."

Now, here we have the whole matter of Judgment before us. Of course, as a moment's thought would show, after an atonement had been made for all the sins of the people, there would be no sense in a judgment of condemnation. If, after the death of the high priest for the atonement or reconciliation of the people, they were still to be condemned in judgment, what was the use of his death or sacrifice?

The very object of the death, the sacrifice or atonement, was the *justification* of the people before God. Thereby they were cleansed from all their legal sins, were justified, and the errors and sins of the preceding year were put away, blotted out, forgiven; and they began a new life for the year succeeding the great day of atonement.

This was the judgment that followed the death which the high priests of the Law were appointed to die once every year — *a judgment of Justification* — in which the people were not condemned, but acquitted: "For," as it is written, "he shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, for the tabernacle, and for the altar; and he shall make an atonement for the priests, and *for all the people of the congregation.* And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel, for *all their sins*, once a year." Lev. xvi.

Can anything be plainer? Can the most careless reader mistake the purpose and result of this judgment, after the death of the high priest on the great day of atonement? "For *all* the people — for *all* their sins."

Now, the argument of the apostle is this: "*As* it was appointed to the high priests to die for *the justification of all the people of Israel, so* Christ was offered or died *for all the world*," hence his superiority. Of course, this superiority is based on his absolutely *doing* for the world, what the high priest did for the Jews. This is an important point. The high priest made atonement, as we have seen, for *all* the congregation, for *all* their sins; and he actually and legally justified all for whom he died?

Now, Christ died for all mankind, and if all mankind are not justified or delivered from all their sins, then he is not only not *superior*, but absolutely *inferior* to the Law priests; for they accomplished all they intended to by their death, while Christ wholly, or in a great measure, fails.

Let us repeat this, for it is the pivot on which the argument turns: The high priest justified from sin, all for whom he died. Now, if Christ does not justify all for whom he died, then there is no superiority on his part. For how many, then, did he die? "He tasted death for every man." "He gave himself a ransom for all." Of course, then, "all," "every man," must be justified through the blood of Christ, or he is inferior to the high priest of the Law; and so the very point of the apostle's reasoning is blunted, and the whole argument of the epistle goes to the ground.

But, thanks be to God, the apostle is right, and the death of Christ is *not* a failure. It is certified by John (1 Epist. i.) that "the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin;" that he has "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" and, finally, that "he is

the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world!" 1 John ii. 2.

This, then, is the judgment after death, viz: the judgment of justification, of cleansing and redemption, which Christ procures for the world by his death, by his own blood, shed for the remission of sin. For "he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

And as the people waited in the outer court for the appearance of the high priest, who came forth, on the completion of the sacrifice, to announce to them that they were justified before the Lord, all their sins being blotted out; so the apostle represents Christ as appearing a second time, to the waiting and expectant world, "without sin unto salvation." The word rendered "sin" here, means "sin-offering." After his atoning sacrifice, he comes "without a sin offering," because no more is needed, since his "blood cleanseth us from all sin;" he comes "unto salvation," to bring salvation to the world looking for him as the great Deliverer, who is to lead them to the joy that is within the veil, whither he, as our forerunner, hath entered for us. And so the judgment after death is only another confirmation of the universal justification and redemption in Christ.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS.

SECTION I.

THE REWARDS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Those who have truly known the joys of experimental religion, the sweet peace of believing in Jesus and trusting in God, will scarcely require any instruction as to what constitutes the proper rewards of faith, and love, and obedience, of holiness and true piety. They have the testimony in their own souls, and fully understand those sayings of the Master: "The kingdom of God is within you;" "The kingdom of heaven is righteousness, and peace, and the joy of the Holy Spirit." Such as these expect no reward for living a Christian life, but the supreme blessedness of the life itself. They are grateful to God, that he has "delivered them from the power of darkness, and translated them into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom they have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins;" (Col. i.,) and they look forward to the bliss of the life immortal, as the "free gift of God," and not as anything to which they are entitled by faith, or by obedience to that divine law made for their own good, and in the keeping of which there *is* great reward.

But there are those who need instruction on this

point; and it is important that they should be led to review the whole question of Righteousness and its Rewards; both from the stand point of the inner life of the soul, and from the direct teachings of Revelation. It is needful that they should become acquainted with the laws of our moral and spiritual nature, and the manner in which these work out their results in the daily experiences of life. Let us, then, proceed to investigate this all-important subject, reverently, and with a prayer that we may be enlightened from above as to the things which belong to our peace.

Through all nature, this law prevails, in every department of human life and action — the thing done, the thought we cherish, what we are in ourselves — that is our reward or our punishment, our heaven or our hell.

If a noble impulse, or a generous sentiment, or a Christian sympathy, come to a man, and he opens his heart to them with earnest welcome, and rejoices in their company, and gladly gives them room and entertainment, he asks no reward for this; for he is the gainer immensely by their coming. They bring their blessing with them; they make a heaven for him in his own soul; and the longer they remain with him, the more he sees that he gives nothing and receives all.

This holy thought, this generous feeling, has made all within him bright, beautiful, and blessed; and if there be anything due, it is *from* him, not *to* him. He has no claim of reward to set up for having entertained this heavenly guest. The balance is against him; for he was infinitely richer than before it came and he will be poor enough when it leaves him.

"Jesus answered, and said, If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love *him*, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John xiv. 23. Who, in such case, gains most; the man, or God and the Saviour? And what man is he, who, if these *will* come to take up their abode with him, would think, therefore, that he ought to be paid for entertaining them? that he ought to have reward for giving them room in his soul? Who, if God should come to dwell with him, would not feel that this, in itself, was reward enough, heaven enough?

How little, then, can they understand the true spirit of religion, or the nature of holiness and righteousness, who look outside of these for their reward; who expect to be paid hereafter for opening the heart for the incoming of the Holy Spirit here![1] They seem not to comprehend this matter at all. As stated, the thing done is its own reward, there is no other; and properly and logically, there can be no other. And the principle involved in this statement, rules throughout the physical, social, moral, and reli-

[1] Though this presentation of the doctrine may be denied in words, yet substantially this is it: If you are good, if you will love and obey God here, you shall go to heaven when you die; but, if you do not, you shall go to hell. What else is this but making heaven hereafter, the reward of goodness here? What more can be made of it? STUART MILL, in his Essay on Liberty, says, with great truth: "Our popular religious ethics, by holding out the hope of heaven and the threat of hell, as the appointed and appropriate motives to a virtuous life, fall far below the best of the ancients, and do what they can to give to human morality an essentially selfish character: and there is even now resulting a low, abject, servile type of character, which, submit itself as it may to what it deems the Supreme will, is incapable of rising to or sympathizing in the conception of Supreme Goodness."

gious worlds. It prevails in all human action and experience.

For the sake of giving a personal direction and force to the argument, let me address myself directly to the reader: You are sick; the hot blood runs riot in your veins, the fever is burning within you, and, like a fire, is consuming the life within. A kind and skilful physician comes in, administers his medicine, carefully watches over you by day and by night, and at last restores you to health again. Now, do you send in your bill to him, or does he send in his bill to you? Do you expect to be paid for taking the medicine, for being cured? or do you expect to pay him? Let us apply this illustration.

We are morally and spiritually diseased: God furnishes us the means of recovery, and finally restores us again, through Christ, to the health and strength of a righteous life. Where is the debt here? What reward shall we have for this? Shall we turn round upon our heavenly benefactor, the great Physician of souls, and demand a reward for having allowed him to restore us and save us? for having received, at his hands, the gift of spiritual health, and all the inestimable blessings it brings with it? What could be more monstrously ungrateful?

Let us take another illustration. Suppose a traveller comes to your door in a dark and stormy night, tells you that he is lost, that he is cold and hungry, and nearly perished from long exposure; and he begs you to give him shelter and food. You take him in, feed him and warm him; and on the morrow you go with him, show him the way to the high road, and give him a map of the country by which he can make the rest of his journey in safety.

Suppose, after a few days or weeks, this man returns and demands of you a reward for having entered your house, warmed himself at your fire, eaten of your food, and finally for having followed your directions, using your chart, until he had made his way to the place he sought! What would you say to such a creature as this? Could any language express the absurdity of his demand.

Were not the shelter, the food that staid his hunger, the kind regard you showed him, your map and guidance — were not these a blessing to him, safety, life and deliverance? Did he not find in these, all that a sane man could ask? And could he not see that the obligation was all on his side — and that if either party was to be paid, it was you, and not he?

Well, this supposed case represents exactly the condition of mankind — they are lost, they are out in the wilderness, cold and starving for the bread of life. And God mercifully looks on their pitiful condition, sends Christ to show them the way of life and deliverance, feeds them with the bread of heaven, gives them the Bible as a map of direction, and sends them on their way rejoicing. Now, when they have eaten of the heavenly manna, when they have read the Bible and rejoiced in its truth, and found the way of life and peace, shall they be so utterly dead to all gratitude, so blinded in mind and heart, as to turn round, and demand that *their* goodness in accepting these mercies, shall be rewarded with the infinite glories of the immortal world!

These illustrations will help to show the thoughtful how impossible it is to separate righteousness from its rewards; to show that if we do not find our

reward in repentance and reformation, in forsaking our sins, in being good, in loving God, in holiness of spirit, in charity and purity, in obedience to the divine commands — then there is no reward for us, neither here nor hereafter.

But this expectation of future rewards seems to be the result of generalizing too loosely on the subject, A little analysis of the claim, or of its foundations. will discover how groundless it is. Let me solicit the attention of the reader to one or two particulars.

You have visited a sick sufferer, and cheered him by your sympathy, and comforted him in his sorrows — or you have given food to a hungry family, and brought joy into their desolate home — or you have reclaimed a sinner from the error of his ways, and made him a useful and happy man. Now, is it on either of these acts of goodness that you found your expectation of heaven? Of course not.

Then if not upon this particular act, on which one, or on what number of them put together, do you found it? Where does the claim begin? If one deed of mercy does not entitle you to immortal life and joy, how many will? Beside, how can any number of finite acts reach the measure of an infinite reward?

But aside from this, did you find no joy in the deed itself? The look of gratitude, the trembling words of thankfulness, the blessedness you imparted, the deliverance you had wrought out — were not these your reward? Has not the memory of them made pleasant music in your heart ever since? And have you not realized the truth of the declaration, that "the good man shall be satisfied from himself"?

Prov. xiv. 14. And also of those divine words of Jesus, "Give, and it shall be given you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosoms." Luke vi. 38. Assuredly; for this is the universal law.

But lest it be said, these examples are all from the objective side, or mere morality, let us turn to the subjective sphere of religion, or to the personal experience of the Christian, examples of devotion and piety.

1. *Prayer.* In the midst of some sore affliction you have prayed to God, earnestly, fervently, with a devout, trusting, loving heart — the heavens open above you, as you are lifted up on the wings of supplication; your spiritual vision grows clearer every moment; God seems near to you, your spirit goes forth to meet him; the joy, the bliss of communion and heavenly fellowship is yours, and peace and strength divine have found place in your heart. This is prayer, this is worship, such as the angels know.

And now do you rise up from this fervent and blessed prayer, and expect, or desire, or even think of, a future reward for it? But if not for this one, then for what one? — for how many? If this prayer is its own reward, its own heaven, so is every other. All prayer is the same; all true devotion and worship are the same. If one act rewards itself, then a thousand will do the same. If one constitutes no claim to eternal glory, then a thousand will not. The same holy joy which makes the prayer of to-day a blessing in itself, will make every prayer of the long-

est life an equal blessing; and so the claim of future reward will have no point of beginning.

And this present answer to prayer, this blessing born of the spirit of communion, is recognized by all the saints of old. "I called upon the Lord in my distress: the Lord answered me, and set me in a large place." "I sought the Lord, and he delivered me from all my fears." "O Lord God, I cried unto thee, and thou hast healed me." "The righteous cry, and the Lord heareth, and *delivereth them* out of all their troubles." "In the day when I cried, thou answeredst me, and strengthenedst me with strength in my soul." Psalms, everywhere. "For every one that asketh, *receiveth*, and he that seeketh, *findeth*, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." Matt. vii. "And whatsoever we ask, *we receive* of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things which are pleasing in his sight." 1 John iii.

2. *Faith.* And does not faith also bring its reward along with it? We have been long wandering in doubt, in the darkness of unbelief, filled with that "fear which hath torment." But at last the Spirit of Truth moves upon the darkened soul, sanctifying the word of life to its needs, and kindling within it the light of faith and trust. Now we believe—believe in God as the beneficent and loving Father, ever holding us in the arms of his mercy; directing all our affairs, our joys and sorrows, the good and the evil of our lot, to gracious results; following us in his everlasting kindness through this world, through all worlds beyond, with his paternal blessing, and finally crowning us with immortal joys — we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God, the good

Shepherd who gave his life for the sheep; as the Way, the Life and the Truth, the Saviour of the world, who gave himself for our sins, "that he might deliver us from this present evil world," and accomplish our translation "into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

Thus believing, thus delivered, comforted and rejoicing, do we demand or wish for any other reward than this very blessedness of faith itself? Do we not see how he who believeth is saved, entereth into rest, into that heaven of serenest peace and trust ever open to the believer? There is no reward for believing in God and Christ but what is inherent in, inseparable from, the belief itself. Faith is the tree of life, and strength and peace and joy ineffable, are the fruit of it; and you can no more put faith in this world, and its rewards in the next, than you can plant the tree in one country and gather the fruit in another.

And on this point, also, the Bible is explicit, that faith is its own reward, its own joy. "Thou wilt keep him *in perfect peace*, whose mind is stayed on thee, *because* he trusteth in thee." Isa. xxvi. "Blessed *is* the man that trusteth in the Lord." Jer. xvii. "Therefore, *being justified* by faith, we *have* peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. iv. "So then, they which be of faith *are* blessed with faithful Abraham." 2 Cor. i. "For by grace *are* ye saved, through faith." Eph. ii. "We that have believed *do enter* into rest." Heb. iv. "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace *in believing*, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost." Rom. xiv. "Verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me

hath everlasting live." John vi. 47. "Believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, receiving the end of your faith, *even the salvation of your souls.*" 1 Pet. i. 8, 9. *Rejoicing*, not shall rejoice hereafter; *receiving* the salvation of your souls, not after death, but now, as the fruitage and end of your faith. Faith creates its own heaven in the soul of the true believer; and he never thinks of waiting for it till he dies.

3. *Love.* And what reward does the Christian ask for loving God? Any attempt to answer this in a way to make the reward additional to the love itself, will show how difficult, as well as absurd, it is. Consider for a moment how strange and unnatural it would be to offer a mother a rich reward of gold, fine houses and dresses, for loving her children! Can we think of anything betraying greater ignorance of the real nature of love, of true affection?

But this is exactly the thing the creeds of the day represent God as doing—as offering the reward of future honor and glory to men, if they will only love and honor him here. And yet a moment's thought would show that either it is wholly unnecessary, or the thing required is wholly impossible.

If God be infinitely lovely and loveable, and we see this and feel it, then it is unnecessary; for we shall be drawn to him, and love him, not for any future heaven, but because we cannot help it—by the same law which binds our hearts to our parents, or that of the mother to her child. And the reward is in the peace and joy of loving. Love is its own heaven, and is satisfied in and of itself.

But if God be infinitely cruel and hateful and hat-

ing, then the thing required, the thing for which he offers the reward, is impossible. We *cannot* love him — not the terrors of a thousand hells can drive, not the rewards of a thousand heavens can bribe, the heart into a single pulse of true affection. It must come freely, or not at all; and it can only come freely when there is something to attract it, to call it into life. And then it is filled with its own fulness of joy, and asks nothing more; and you cannot make a heaven for it outside of itself.

Finally, let us ask the question, What do we mean by heaven? Is it not a state of perfect holiness and love, of constant communion with God?

But if holiness and love and communion with God, are not their own reward here, why should they be hereafter? They are the same in their nature and effects everywhere; and if we are to be rewarded in heaven for our holiness and worship on earth, where are we to be rewarded for the holiness and worship of heaven? What can God give us there for being holy and loving him? Nothing but the joy and bliss of being holy and loving with all the soul! But that we can have here; and the only difference between the heaven of the Christian here and hereafter is in quantity, not in quality. Here we see through a glass darkly; there, face to face. Here we bear the image of the earthy; there we shall be in the image of the heavenly. Here everything is imperfect; there everything is perfect.

The simple truth is, the sincere Christian asks no reward but the peace, the holy trust, the communion with God, the calm and abiding blessedness, which he finds in *being* a Christian. With this he is con-

tent, and looking forward to the infinite beauty and glory of the immortal life, he expects it not as wages, not as a reward, but as the gift of God's great love, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

And throughout the Bible this presentation of the case prevails. In addition to the texts already cited, under special heads, consider the following from among thousands showing the present reward and heaven of the soul truly united to God and Christ in faith and obedience. "Great peace *have* they that love thy law." "Wisdom's ways *are* ways of pleasantness, and all her paths *are* peace." "*In keeping* thy commandments there *is* great reward." "He that worketh righteousness shall *never* be moved." "Blessed *are* they that keep judgment, and he that doeth righteousness at all times." "In the way of righteousness *is life*, and in the pathway thereof is no death." "Blessed *is* the man that trusteth in the Lord." "God *is* a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." "Righteousness and peace *have* kissed each other,"—i. e., are intimately and closely united as loving friends. "All things *work* together for good to them that love God." "He that followeth after righteousness, *findeth* life and honor." "The steps of the good man are ordered by the Lord." "God *giveth* to a man that which is good in his sight, wisdom and knowledge and joy." "He that keepeth the law, happy *is* he." "Be careful to maintain good works, for these things *are* good and profitable unto men." "Unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy; for thou *renderest* to every man according to his work." "The fruit of the spirit *is* love, joy, peace." "Neither shall they say, lo here! or lo

there! for behold, *the kingdom of God is within you.*"

SECTION II.

THE PUNISHMENT OF SIN — THE LAW AND ITS PENALTIES.

In the discussion of this subject, we start with the fundamental truth of Christian Theology, that God is a Being of infinite goodness; or, as John says, "God is Love." Out of this comes the law, out of this come all penalties and punishments, with this they must harmonize, and into this, at last, they must all be resolved.

God is, also, possessed of infinite knowledge, and sees what is in the hearts of all men. He knows, therefore, the actual condition of every soul, and the exact amount of punishment needed in every instance for the correction of the evil. So much he inflicts, and no more, being governed entirely by the moral need of the transgressor. If one needs ten stripes, they are given; if another, for the same offence, is subdued into repentance by five stripes, only five are inflicted. The same end is gained in both cases, though the amount of punishment differs.

And now, to have the subject fairly before us, let us fall back on first principles, and ask,

§ I. *What is the object of the law?* Why did God institute any government at all over man? Why did he not leave us to go our own way? What specific object had God in view in making laws, and affixing penalties to them?

These are important questions, and they go to the root of the matter. Some object was aimed at by this arrangement. God does not act without a pur-

pose. He must have designed to accomplish some special end by this net work of laws and penalties; and we can only understand the philosophy of punishment, by understanding what the end aimed at is.

It is safe to say that God did not establish the present order of things for his own benefit; that he did not command us to do this, or to do that, for his own sake, because he expected to derive any benefit from it. He is perfect in himself, filled with his own fulness.

So it is safe, also, to say he does not forbid us doing anything, through fear of any injury or inconvenience he may suffer from it. He gains nothing by our obedience — he suffers nothing by our disobedience.

This is a very important point in our discussion of the question; because most of the Christian world reason as if they thought they were doing God service by keeping his commandments, and were, therefore, entitled to some reward; while the sinner, by his transgression, had inflicted a grievous wrong on the Almighty, and for this reason deserved punishment.

But this cannot be allowed for a moment. God is lifted infinitely above all we can do. He is neither benefited by our righteousness, nor injured by our sins. How forcibly the Scriptures state this point: "Look unto the heavens, and see; and behold the clouds, which are higher than thou. If thou sinnest, what doest thou against him? or, if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto him? And if thou be righteous, what givest thou him? or what receiveth he of thine hand? Thy wicked-

ness may hurt a man as thou art; and thy righteousness may profit the son of man." Job. xxxv.

The Law, then, is enacted for the benefit of man. Obedience profits him; disobedience injures him. God acts in the matter as an all-wise and loving parent, who seeks the interests and happiness of his children. He knows what is for their good; he knows that goodness and righteousness will secure their peace, and permanent welfare. This he commands; his law requires it.

He knows that sin and wickedness will make them miserable, and this he forbids by his law, because he loves his children, and he would have them avoid all evil for this very reason.

Let me ask, Why does the parent make laws and rules for his children? Because he loves them, and is conscious that his knowledge and experience are needful to their safety and happiness. If the parent knows the motive of his own commands, if he knows why he wishes his children to do right, and avoid wrong, then he has in his own heart the great secret of God's moral government over man, the source out of which comes the divine law. God is Love, and his laws are not the arbitrary decrees of a despot who wishes merely to show his power, and his right to command; but they are the requirements, the salutary counsels and warnings of an infinitely good and gracious Father, who aims, in all things, at the happiness of his children.

And now, if we have come to understand clearly, the origin, purpose, and aim of the Law, we are ready to meet the next important question.

§ II. *What is the object of the penalty?* or, in

other words, Why does God punish at all those who transgress his law?

This is *the* point of our inquiry; it is the pivot on which it all turns. But the way is opened by what has already been said. One thing is sure, that the law and the penalty come equally out of infinite Goodness and infinite Justice. There can be no contradiction, no collision between the two. God does not build up with one hand, and tear down with the other. He does not oppose his own work; nor is he so short-sighted in his arrangements, that one conflicts with another.

If the law be expressly designed for the happiness of man, the penalty, which is part of the machinery of the law, will not be of such a nature as to defeat this design. If the law seek his eternal good, the penalty cannot seek his eternal evil. This would, as said, make God at war with himself, make him the most inconsistent being in the universe.

Let me illustrate this point. Suppose you purchase a watch; on examination you find it made with exquisite skill, and put together with great care, with a view to its measuring time with the greatest exactness. On setting it in motion, you find it goes too slow, or too fast; and accordingly introduce the action of the *regulator*, which immediately stops the watch altogether. You take it forthwith to the maker, and the following dialogue ensues:

Did you make this watch to keep time correctly? "Yes." Did you insert this regulator? "I did." Did you know it would stop the watch, and entirely prevent it from keeping time? "Yes." What did you put it in for, then?

What answer could he make? None, of course; for if he knew the regulator would stop the watch, then he put it in for that purpose; and if he put it in for that purpose, then he did not make the watch to keep time. The regulator, in order to be a regulator, must work in harmony with the rest of the watch, not against it, not so as to defeat the object for which the watch was made.

Now, the penalty of the divine law, or punishment, is to the law what the regulator is to the watch; and cannot, therefore, be intended to defeat the object of the law, but to promote it. The law is designed to secure the good of man; and punishment, which is a part of the law's appliances, must be designed for the same thing, and not for the opposite of it.

When sinners, therefore, transgress the law made for their good, God punishes them, not for their evil or injury, but for their good; to restore them to obedience, and so secure that happiness which they would have enjoyed, without the process of punishment, if they had obeyed the law in the first place.

In the well chosen language of *Sir James Stephens*, who fills the Chair of History in Edinburgh College, and who rejects the doctrine of endless punishment, as the penalty of the Divine Law: "That which Infinite Love, directed by Omniscience, commands, must be for the highest good of him to whom the command is addressed; and disobedience to such commands, must consequently be the suicidal abandonment and rejection of happiness. To prevent that suicide, or to reclaim the self-destroyer into the ways of peace, Love will resort to a discipline as stern, severe, and formidable, as the inveteracy of the moral disorder may require. Such love will never degen-

erate into fondness, nor shrink from the infliction of any *remedial* punishment, however protracted or acute. . . . . God remembers we are but dust, and will not always chide, nor keep his anger for ever." And again, he says: "It is impossible, unless one amuses himself with phrases, or voluntarily blinds himself, by placing on a level the Divine justice and the imperfect justice of men, to attribute to a God infinitely good, who is charity itself, who loves all his children with an equal love, any other intention, when he permits evil to bring evil, and the wicked to be punished, than to correct him, to confound and bring him back, to convert him, and give him a heaven in place of a hell. Yes, all suffering sent by the celestial Father to his children, is a lesson, or else it is irreconcilable with his most evident attributes." [1]

And with what striking force of words, Dr. Young, in his "Night Thoughts," has given utterance to this truth, so comforting to man, so honorable to God:

> "Who without pain's advice would e'er be good?
> Who, without death, but would be good in vain?
> Pain is to save from pain, *all punishment*
> *To make for peace*; and death to save from death:
> And second death to guard immortal life!
> By the same tenderness divine ordained
> That planted Eden, and high bloomed for man
> A fairer Eden endless in the skies.
> Great Source of Good alone, how kind in all!
> *In vengeance kind! Pain, Death, Gehenna save.*"[2]

[1] *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, by Sir James Stephens, K C. B.; LL. D., London, 1850, 2d edition. *Epilogue.*

[2] How could Dr. Young believe in *endless* punishment, if he believed "all punishment made for peace," that God was "kind even in vengeance," and that, finally, hell (Gehenna) itself was designed to save, and would save? That he did not believe it, this passage proves, as well as several in his "Last Day;" one of which is quoted on page 88.

And from this stand point we can easily see the unreasonableness of the doctrine of endless punishment. Can anything be more monstrous than the supposition that God, who is infinite in wisdom, should establish a law whose object is to make man eternally happy, and then find himself so hindered and compromised by the penalties of that law, that the next best thing he can do is to shut him up in hell, and make him eternally miserable? What should we think of a physician who, in attempting to cure a sick man, should kill him?

SECTION III.

TESTIMONY OF THE SCRIPTURES TO THE CORRECTIVE NATURE OF PUNISHMENT.

Of course we do not deny that example and the maintenance of the law, have also something to do with the purpose and intention of punishment; but this is always in harmony with the main design, and never excludes it. Punishment as example, recognizes the value of the law, and its direct relation to the general good; and in this general good is included the individual good of the sufferer. Nothing but good has any right to be; and the only claim which the law has to maintenance and obedience, lies in this fact, that its object and aim are universal good.

It is affirmed by some writers, in regard to human laws, that "the reformation of the offender forms no part at all of the design of legal penalty;"[1] and from this they argue that it must be so with divine penalties or punishments, and thus they make manifest the

[1] "*Love and Penalty*, by Joseph P. Thompson, D. D.," New York, 1860, page 182.

difference between their own teachings and reasonings, and those of the inspired men of God. Instead of making God's law the standard, and lifting human laws up to it, these men make human laws the standard, and bring down God's law to that. The law of man punishes in such a way, and for such a purpose; therefore the law of God will do the same. The perfect is measured by the imperfect; and because blind and ignorant man cannot determine the exact degree of guilt, and adjust the penalty to the desired end, therefore the omniscient God cannot!

But let us consider specially the assertion that the penalty of transgression has nothing to do with the reformation of the transgressor. In Leviticus xxvi. it is written, "If ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all these commandments; and if ye despise my statutes" — (here we have the *law;* and now for the penalty) — "I also will do this unto you. I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart," &c. (And now for the object of this penalty:) "And *if ye will not for this hearken unto me*, then will I punish you yet seven times more for your sins, ... and *if ye will not be* REFORMED by me by these things," &c. And yet we are told that "the *reformation* of the offender forms no part at all of the design of legal penalty!"

"Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth *mercy*, for thou renderest unto every man according to his work." Ps. lii. 12. Here the penalty is declared to be administered in such manner and spirit as to make it an evidence of the divine mercy, aiming to secure the good of the sufferer.

"Behold, *happy* is the man whom God *correcteth*, therefore, despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty; for he maketh sore, and bindeth up; he woundeth, and his hands make whole.' Job. v. David, whom God's judgments found out for his great sins, says, in grateful acknowledgment of the reforming power of his punishment, "Before I was afflicted, I went astray, but now have I kept thy word..... Thou art good, and doest good..... I know, O Lord, that thy judgments are right, and that in faithfulness thou hast afflicted me. It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn thy statutes." Ps. cxix. 67, 71, 75.

In the work just referred to, it is said that "judgment and penalty are suspended in this world, in order that means of reformation may be tried." But David sets up no such distinction. He plainly asserts the fact that God's judgments and his afflictions are identical, and that by these he was reformed, and turned from the paths in which he had gone astray. He does not say "judgment was suspended that means of reformation might be tried," but that the *judgment* itself was the means of reformation, the "admonitory and corrective discipline" by which he learned God's statutes, and kept his word.

So the wise man says, "My son, despise not thou the *chastening of* the Lord, nor weary of his *correction;* for whom the Lord loveth he *correcteth*, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth." Prov. iii. 11. Here the punishments of God are illustrated by those of an affectionate earthly father, who chastens and corrects his erring son whom he loves, *because* he loves him. And how perfectly this har-

monizes with the passage already cited from Hebrews, where we are assured that God chastens "*for our profit*, that we might be *partakers of his holiness*"; and though "for the present it seemeth to be grievous, nevertheless it afterward yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby." xii. Has *endless* punishment any *afterward* to it? Does it yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them who are exercised thereby?

"The Lord will not cast off forever; but though he cause grief, yet he will have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies, for he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." Lam. iii. Nothing can be more direct than this. Grief and affliction are not chosen for their own sake; they are not perpetual — but are employed in kindness; and, the corrective result gained, the Lord "will have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies."

And in his rebuke of his sinful people he says, "*Thine own wickedness shall correct thee*, and thy backslidings shall reprove thee: know therefore, and see, that it is an evil thing and bitter, that thou hast forsaken the Lord thy God." Jer. ii. 19. Here the fact that wickedness brings in its train bitterness and sorrow, and that this penalty of forsaking the Lord and his law was not only designed to correct, but *would* correct them, is positively affirmed.

And how plainly and instructively this truth is confirmed in the oft-quoted, and always pleasing history of the prodigal son. Did not the punishment of his sin, the "evil thing and bitter" which his wickedness brought upon him, finally correct him, and lead

him to say, "I will arise and go to my Father"? Did he not know and feel the judgments of the Lord on the transgressor of his righteous law, on him who gives himself up to a vicious and abandoned course of life? And, by experience of them, was he not turned from his folly, and brought back from his wanderings?[1]

All these testimonies from the Bible, and many more which might be cited, reveal the general principle on which the heavenly Parent proceeds in his administration of punishments. They show that the law and the penalty are not in conflict, but one in spirit and purpose, though different in method and means; that they both are ordained, not for the good of the Lawgiver, not to secure any advantage to him; but for the good of those to whom the law is given as a rule of conduct. The penalty, or the punish-

[1] The Misses BRONTE, authors of "Jane Eyre," "Shirley," &c., daughters of an English clergyman, were believers in the great restoration. Alluding to the death-scene of an erring brother, one of them says: "How could I endure to think that that poor, trembling soul was hurried away to everlasting torment? It would drive me mad! But thank God for the blessed confidence that, through whatever purging fires the erring spirit may be doomed to pass, whatever fate awaits it, *still it is not lost*; and God, who hateth nothing that he hath made *will bless it in the end.*"—*Tenant of Wildfell Hall.*

It is curious to note how many of the English Church, even of its ministers, past and present, have rejected the doctrine of endless punishment, as Archbishop TILLOTSON, Bishops WARBURTON, RUST, BURNET, &c.; as well as MAURICE, KINGSLEY and others, of to-day. Perhaps the fact finds explanation in the words of Dr. HEY, who says: "It is owing to the moderation of our Church, that we are not called upon to subscribe to the eternity of hell torments; nay, we are not required even to condemn those who presume to affirm that all men will finally be saved."—*Norrisian Lectures*, vol. ii. 389. it is a well-known fact, that in the revision of the articles, in the time of Elizabeth, Article xlii, condemning Universalism as a heresy, was struck out.—*Whittemore's Modern History.*

ment of disobedience, aims at the same thing which the law aims at, viz: to cause mankind to walk in the ways of the Lord, to do right; simply because the right leads to happiness, to the highest good of him who does it. God never inflicts punishment or pain for its own sake, as an end; but only as a means. He never rests in it as final, as the thing sought, the thing he is satisfied to make permanent and endless.

It may interest the reader, and profit him, to compare the preceding reasoning on the nature and object of divine punishments, with the views entertained by some of the Universalist Fathers of the early Christian Church.

Clemens Alexandrinus, A. D. 190, says: "Punishment is, in its operation, like medicine; it dissolves the hard heart, purges away the filth of uncleanness, and reduces the swellings of pride and haughtiness; thus restoring its subject to a sound and healthful state."[1]

Origen, A. D. 230. "The sacred Scripture does, indeed, call "our God a consuming fire," (Deut. iv. 24,) and says that "rivers of fire go before his face," (Dan. vii. 10,) and that "he shall come as a refiner's fire, and purify the people," (Mal. iii. 2.) As, therefore, God is a consuming fire, what is it that is to be consumed by him? We say it is wickedness, and whatever proceeds from it, such as is figuratively called "wood, hay, and stubble," (1 Cor. iii.) which denote the evil works of man. Our God is a consuming fire in this sense; and he shall come as a refiner's fire to purify rational nature from the alloy of

[1] *Pedagog*, i. 8.

wickedness, and other impure matter which has adulterated the intellectual gold and silver; consuming whatever of evil is admixed in all the soul."[1]

Titus, Bishop of Bostra, A. D. 364, says: "The punishments of God are holy, as they are remedial and salutary in their effect upon transgressors; for they are inflicted, not to preserve them in their wickedness, but to make them cease from their sins. The abyss of hell is, indeed, the place of torment, but it is not eternal. The anguish of their sufferings compels them to break off from their sins."[2]

Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, A. D. 370, states his belief as follows: "I believe that punishment will be administered in proportion to each one's corruptness. For it would be unequal to torment with the same purgatorial pains, him who has long indulged in transgression, and him who has only fallen into a few common sins. But that grievous flame shall burn for a longer or shorter period, according to the kind and quantity of the matter that supports it. Therefore, to whom there is much corruption attached, with him it is necessary that the flame which is to consume it, should be great, and of long duration; but to him in whom the wicked disposition has been already in part subjected, a proportional degree of that sharpness and more vehement punishment shall be remitted. *All evil, however, must at length be entirely removed from every thing, so that it shall no more exist.* For such being the nature of sin, that it cannot exist with-

[1] *Contra Celsum*, Lib. iv. 13; a work in which are anticipated nearly all the modern replies to infidelity; as indeed the work of Celsus, which it answers, anticipates all the attacks on Christianity from that class represented by the English infidels of the 18th century.

[2] *Contra Manich.* Lib. i.

out a corrupt motive, it must, of course, be perfectly dissolved and wholly destroyed, so that nothing can remain a receptacle of it, when all motive and influence shall spring from God alone." [1]

This perfect agreement between ancient and modern Universalists, respecting the remedial nature of divine punishments, is instructive; and suggestive of much to those who regard the doctrine of Universal Restoration as of recent origin.

[1] *De Anima et Resurrectione.*

Novatus, or Novatian, who was perhaps, the rival of Cornelius for the Bishopric of Rome, A. D., 250, maintained that the "wrath and indignation of the Lord, so called, are not such passions as bear those names in man; but that they are operations of the divine mind directed solely to our purification." — *De Regula Fidei*, cap. iv. Yet he was very severe himself towards lapsed professors.— *Mosheim* i. 202.

I shall probably have no better place than this, to call attention to the extensive prevalence of Universalism in the primitive church. A D. 190–550 show among its advocates many of the most pious, learned, and influential of the Christian Fathers, as Clement, Origen, Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, Titus, Bishop of Bostra, Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, Didymus the Blind, one of the most remarkable and erudite men of his time, Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, the birth-place of Paul, Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, Fabius Marius Victorinus, &c. It is easy to see to what extent the doctrine must have prevailed among the lesser clergy and laity, when so many of the dignitaries of the church taught it publicly. And it is a most significant fact, little known, respecting the famous Catechetical School of Alexandria, the great Educational and Theological Seminary of the early Church (bearing to it the relation which the Andover Seminary bears to New England Theology,) that *three of its most popular and distinguished Presidents were Universalists!* Surely, Universalism was the orthodoxy of the Church at that period, or those having the church and its ministry and its youth in their charge, were culpably recreant to their duty. Doederlein, a long time ago, said, that "the more distinguished by erudition any one was in ancient Christian times, by so much the more did he cherish and defend the hope of a final termination of torments—*Quanto quis altius eruditione in antiquitate Christiana eminuit, tanto magis spem finiendorum olim cruciatuum aluit atque defendit.*"—*Institut. Theol. Christiani.* Noremberg, 1787, vol ii p. 199. Whittemore's Hist. p. 290.

And now, proceeding with the argument, let us add that even in those cases where a city or a nation is destroyed for their sins, and where, of course, example and warning form a leading feature of the judgment, the element of good, of correction and restoration, is not lost sight of. From the necessities of the case, the very conditions of national life, men cannot be dealt with, in this collective capacity, in the same way, or punished by the same agencies, as in the case of individual transgression and retribution. Still, as remarked, the important truth that punishment is a means and not an end, that it looks to a state of things beyond itself, is always discoverable.

As an example, take the well known passage which closes the parable of the sheep and goats: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." Matt. xxv. 46. Now, in this passage, which prophecied the overthrow of the corrupt and guilty nation of the Jews and the judgment of punishment under which they are still suffering, the word rendered "punishment," is κόλασις. The primary meaning of this word is *pruning* or *trimming*, as of a tree; cutting away distorted and diseased limbs and branches, and restoring it to symmetry and a healthy condition — *restraint* or *discipline*, in the way of correcting, or for the purpose of preventing farther injury.

There is a remarkable passage in Plato, illustrating the meaning and usage of this word. It is in the *Protagoras*, and is as follows: "For the natural or accidental evils of others,"— as weakness or dwarfishness of person, or deformity of body — "no one gets angry, or admonishes, or teaches, or punishes (*kolazei*,) them; but we pity those afflicted with

such misfortunes. But if any do not have those virtues, which are the fruit of careful culture, of instruction and labor, but have the contrary vices (or evils;) in such case we have for these indignation, admonitions, and punishments (*kolaseis.*) For if, O Socrates, you will consider *what* is the design of punishing (*kolazein*) the wicked, this, of itself, will show you that men think virtue something that may be acquired; for no one punishes (*kolazei,*) the wicked, looking to the past only, simply for the wrong he *has* done — that is, no one does this, who does not act like a wild beast, desiring only revenge, without thought — but he who seeks to punish (*kolazein,*) with reason, *does not punish for the sake of the past wrong deed* (because he cannot undo what is already done;) *but for the sake of the future*, that neither the man himself who is punished, may do wrong again, nor any other who has seen him chastised. And he who entertains this thought, must believe that virtue may be taught; and he punishes (*kolazei,*) for the purpose of deterring from wickedness."[1]

Now, here we see the meaning of *kolasis*, the original word in the phrase "everlasting punishment," as defined by one of the most learned and eminent of the Greek philosophers. The corrective and reformatory element is the radical one, the distinguishing force of the word; while, at the same time, that of

[1] *Protagoras*, or the Sophist, Sec. 38, Bohn's edition, vol. i. p. 252. There is a similar passage in the *Gorgias:* "This man here cannot bear to experience in himself the thing we are talking about, the being chastised" (*kolazomanos.*) "But to punish (*kolazesthai*) the soul, is better than unrestrained indulgence (*akolasia.*)" Correction or discipline is better than lawless indulgence. The above is wiser teaching than much that passes for Christianity on this subject.

warning or example is intended — but this is for good, and not for evil. There is nothing purely retaliatory or vindictive. And while, as we have observed, in national judgments example necessarily forms a leading feature, yet correction is never lost sight of.

And how clearly is this seen in the very case in hand, the "everlasting punishment," (*kolasin,*) into which the Jewish nation was sent on the destruction of their city and temple. God did not intend to say that their punishment should be *endless*, any more than he meant to say that they should possess the land of Canaan endlessly, when he promised that it should be to them "an *everlasting* possession." If he had intended to declare it endless, he would have chosen some other word than *kolasis*, which, as we have seen, necessarily involves the idea of correction and restoration, and is, therefore, in direct conflict with the idea of endlessness.[1] But he evidently chose this term with a purpose, indicating thereby that he did not design to cast off his ancient people, hopelessly and finally.

Hence Paul says, distinctly and positively, that when this *kolasis* or punishment, shall have reached its limit, and Israel is corrected; or, in his own

[1] And this is a strong collateral proof that *aionios* does not signify endless, for if *kolasis* radically implies such kind of treatment as improves, corrects and restores, this is conclusive evidence that it cannot be endless — for endless correction or restoration is a contradiction in terms. *Kolasis*, by its very nature, is temporary, and therefore *aionios* cannot be endless. The noun restricts the adjective. As when we say "a great continent," the word "continent" expands the word "great" to the extent of its own boundaries; but when we say "a great farm," the word "farm" limits the word "great" to *its* boundaries, exceedingly small compared with the other. See this discussed in Chap. xi.

words, when this "blindness in part" which "is happened to Israel," is removed, and "the fulness of the Gentiles is come in," then "*all Israel* shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; for this is my covenant unto them *when I shall take away their sins*." Rom. xi.

SECTION IV.

THE PRESENT A STATE OF RETRIBUTION, AND NOT OF PROBATION.[1]

That some good men seem outwardly, or in material things, to be more afflicted, to be subjected to greater evil and suffering than some evil men, few will be disposed to dispute. Many good persons are troubled by misfortunes, accidents, sorrows, sickness and bereavements, while others, who are sinful and wicked, escape these, and seem to get on smoothly and happily. This state of things has distressed many pious minds, and led them to say and feel as the people of Israel did of old, that "the way of the Lord is not equal." Ezek. xviii.

In order, therefore, to justify the ways of God, some affirm that "this is a world of probation, and not of retribution"; that "the penalty due to sin is not inflicted here"; and resort to the doctrine of

[1] In the latest labored attempt to defended the doctrine of endless punishment, "Love and Penalty," the work already quoted, it is affirmed that "this is a world of probation and not of retribution," and that "judgment and penalty are suspended." Though the principle involved in this assertion has been reviewed and the argument substantially refuted, in the chapter on the "Scriptural Doctrine of Judgment," as well as in the previous section of this chapter, it may be well to give it a more special notice, for the reason that the error has taken such strong hold on the popular mind.

future Retribution, by which all these inequalities are to be adjusted, and the righteous to be compensated for what they have suffered here, and the wicked to receive endless evil in the place of the good they have enjoyed here.[1] In opposition to this theory, we offer the following:—

§ I. *The argument of facts, of observation and experience.*

The difficulty in the premises is two-fold. *First.* Exalting a few exceptional cases into the force and dignity of a rule. *Second:* An entire misapprehension of the nature of the rewards of righteousness, and of the punishments of sin.

1. The rule is, even in worldly relations, that the righteous, the truly good, are prosperous and happy, and the wicked and criminal are not. Of course there are exceptions in this, as in everything else; but the rule remains—the virtuous are prospered, honored and beloved; while the reverse is true of the wicked.

Look abroad into any country, city or community, and see if it be not so; see if it be not the honest men, the true men, the good men, who in the long run succeed, and hold the high places of trust and honor. Look into the prisons and penitentiaries—and who are these we see here? Are they the righteous men, the Christian men from our midst? Or are they the vile and wicked and criminal?

So universally, indeed, is the rule which governs here established and acknowledged, that it has passed into a kind of proverb. If a young man start in life with good principles; if he is honest, truthful, faith-

[1] See the passages in "Love and Penalty."

ful, pure, religious, we say of him confidently, "He will succeed, he will prosper, he will stand among the noble of the land." But if he is idle, corrupt and wicked, we say with equal confidence, "He will have a miserable life of it; he will come to the state prison or the gallows, or some bad end."

The ground, therefore, on which this charge of inequality rests is not tenable. The difficulty which is supposed to require an adjusting process in the next world does not exist. This is *not* a state of probation, but of retribution; and the penalty due to sin *is* inflicted here. God governs rightly now, and his ways are equal, and it is only man's ways that are unequal.

2. But the grand defect in this false accusation against the divine administration, lies in mistaking the nature of the rewards of virtue, and of the punishments of sin. God does not give so much bread or money for so much goodness; nor does he compensate the righteousness of the righteous with houses and lands, with silks and jewelry, with bodily health and strength, with exemption from the ordinary sorrows and bereavements of our earthly condition.

If the righteous man disobey the laws of health or of organized being, he must pay the penalty of sickness and bodily pain, the same as if he was unrighteous. Neither holiness nor sin has anything to do with the matter. If he is slothful, if he make a foolish bargain, if the storm overtake his ship, or his house stand in the way of a conflagration, he must suffer the consequences, though he be a saint, and pray never so earnestly. Saints and sinners are alike subject to the natural laws.

But what then? Is the way of God unequal? Does the prayer of faith, the love of God, obedience to the moral and spiritual laws go unrewarded? Not at all. These have all that God has promised them. Go the outward world as it will, all within is confident, serene and blessed. The peace of God is always present to the good man. Though the treasures of earth fail him, he has heavenly treasures laid up in his soul which cannot fail. The outward man may be weak, but the inward man is strong. The body may be an hungered, but the spirit feeds on heavenly food. This we have proved and illustrated already.

So the punishments of sin are not poverty, bodily pain, sickness and death, exclusively. By no means. If the morally wicked man obey the physical and organic laws, he shall have health and vigor of body; if he be industrious, prudent and enterprising, he shall get gain; if he sow the seed in spring-time, he shall reap the harvest in autumn. God has promised these rewards to these labors, to this obedience to the natural laws. He will not violate his promise, nor interrupt the order of nature, nor work a miracle, in order to punish him. But if the man be dishonest and false and selfish, he must and will bear the burthen of these sins, in the loss of confidence and business and sympathy, in the contempt and hatred of all who know him — if he become the servant of sin, he must take "the wages of sin," which "is death" — if he live without faith or prayer toward God, he is deprived of all the strength and peace and joy that are the fruit of these.

No matter how large his gains, or how abundant

his harvest, or how great his bodily vigor; if he be guilty of wrong or crime, his retribution goes hand in hand with these. His sin is sure to find him out; conscience will deal her flaming arrows on his soul, however calm and placid the exterior. And here I might set against the assertion that "the penalty due to sin is not inflicted here," the following testimony from an Orthodox journal of the highest rank:—

"The principle of conscience establishes also the inflexible *justice* of God. It has its awards and punishments. It visits the evil-doer with the terrible stings of guilt and remorse, and throws over him the deep chill shadow of a coming retribution. It dashes into every cup of forbidden pleasure, the unfailing, inseparable element of consequent wretchedness. It links together human crime and human suffering, the vices and the miseries of men, so that the one shall follow the other invariably, as sound and echo pursue each other along the mountain side. There is with it no respect of persons, no taking of bribes. With its whip of scorpions it pursues the wrong-doer, whoever he may be, wherever he may go; tracks him into every obscurity, finds him out in the deepest retirement and the darkest night; overtakes him in his swiftest escape, and, like the terrible avenger, pursues and hangs over him wherever he takes his way." [1]

It would be difficult to state the truth in stronger terms than these. And how marvellously the doctrine was verified in the cases of Cain and David, with their anguish cry of, "My punishment is greater

[1] *Bibliotheca Sacra* for Nov., 1849, then under the editorial care of Professors Edwards and Park, assisted by Dr. Robinson and Professor Stuart.

than I can bear"; "the pains of hell gat hold on me: I found trouble and sorrow." But, above all, the confessions of the brethren of Joseph witness to the inexorable severity with which the moral nature works out its retributions.

To all outward appearance it went well enough with these men after their great crime against their brother and father. Bodily health, the fruits of the earth, the increase of flocks and herds, social position, domestic security — all these continued as before, and they *seemed* at perfect peace. But God had not fogotten them, nor the eternal truth set out in the declaration, "Though hand joined in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." Prov. xi. 21. The memory of that great sin haunted them continually; and, singularly enough, this long-hidden fact comes to light at last. The very first words they uttered on finding themselves in trouble and danger, when they had gone out from Joseph's presence, and were alone, are thus recorded: "And they said one to another, we are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear — therefore is this distress come upon us. And Reuben answered them, saying, Spake I not to you, saying, do not sin against the child; and ye would not hear? Therefore, behold also his blood is required." Gen. xlii. There it is, out at last, *after twenty-two years of concealment!* This is the rift opening down into the soul, through which we catch a glimpse of the pent-up fires of hell. Conscience has not slept all this while. She has been throwing up her jets of sulphurous flame and lava continually, though they have fallen within the crater, out of the sight of the world.

But let us look again. *Seventeen years after this*, on the death of Jacob, the very first thing recorded after his burial is this: "Now when Joseph's brethren saw their father was dead, they said, Joseph will peradventure hate us, and will certainly requite us all the evil we did unto him." Gen. l. 15–21.

There it is again! All the kindness of Joseph, all the favors bestowed on them, all the love he had shown them, cannot blot out the remembrance of their sin, nor quiet the accusing conscience. Through all these seventeen years — nay, *these thirty-nine years* — the stinging sense of guilt, the tormenting fear of evil, had hung over them like a threatening thunder-cloud. And now that their old father, who, they thought, stood as a shield between them and Joseph's vengeance, was dead and buried, they were in terror lest he would recall their crime, and requite them all the evil they did him! "And they sent a messenger unto Joseph, saying, Thy father did command before he died, saying, so shall ye say unto Joseph, forgive, I pray thee, now, the trespass of thy brethren, and their sin; for they did unto thee evil. And now, we pray thee, forgive the trespass of the servants of the God of thy father. . . . . And they went and fell down before his face; and they said, Behold, we be thy servants."

Can anything show more eloquently and conclusively than this narrative, that this *is* a state of retribution, and not of probation? Can anything prove more clearly the just and sure awards of conscience to the wrong-doer, or illustrate more forcibly that the wicked are not happy, however prosperous in worldly things? And this is uniformly the positive, as well

as inferential, teaching of the Bible. "The wicked *is* snared in the work of his own hands." "The way of the transgressor *is* hard." "Treasures of wickedness profit nothing." "*In the day* thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." "There *is no peace* to the wicked; they are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt." "They *are* utterly consumed with terrors." "Thorns and snares *are* in the way of the froward." "The curse of the Lord *is* in the house of the wicked." "They that plough iniquity and sow wickedness, *reap* the same." "The wicked man *travaileth with pain all his days*." "In the revenues of the wicked *is* trouble." "To be carnally minded *is* death." "Mischief and sorrow *are* in the midst of the wicked." "The wages of sin *is* death." [1]

Do these inspired witnesses agree with the state-

[1] That the retributions of Conscience are present and continuous, or, in other words, that the moral nature of man carries within itself its rewards and punishments, is slowly getting acknowledgment among theologians and writers on Morals. Dr. Chalmers says, "In the peace and enjoyment of the good affections there is a very present reward, and in the disquietude and agony of the evil affections there is a very present vengeance." And again: "If men should cease to be wicked, all wretchedness and woe would in a great measure be banished from society; and if the character of heaven were re-established upon earth, the blessedness of heaven would be forthwith realized." *Institutes of Theol. i.* 104, 128.

To the same point testifies Dr. Wayland respecting the awards of Conscience: "We can never be disunited from it. It goes with us through all the scenes of life, in company and alone, admonishing, warning, reproving, and recording; and, as a source of happiness or of misery, it must abide with us forever." . . . . "Conscience forewarns us against crime, and inflicts its own peculiar punishment upon guilt." *Moral Science*, pp. 83, 103, 427.

In what sense, then, is this a state of probation? and for what purpose is a future state of punishment ordained for the sins of this state?

ment that "the present is a state of probation," and not of retribution, and that "the penalty due to sin is *not* inflicted here"?

But God is not confined to one method of punishment. Retribution comes also in the form of outward judgments. "The chosen people, in their passage through the wilderness, sinned frequently and provoked their God to anger. They are punished by hunger and thirst; fire belched forth from the bowels of the earth, and consumed some of the offenders; a plague came down upon them; fiery serpents invaded their camp, and stung great numbers of the people; their journey was drawn out into a weary wandering for forty years in a barren desert; and finally there were but two of that whole generation who were suffered to enter into the land of promise. Moses and Aaron, the two leaders of the host, although faithful in the main, yet having sinned, — the one by anger, and the other by countenancing the people in their idolatry, — are not permitted to set foot on Canaan. The sons of Eli digrace the office of the priesthood by their unholy acts; a sentence from on high is pronounced against them, and they are slain as they bore the ark in battle with the Philistines. Balaam contends against Israel in spite of God's command to the contrary, and in return for his frowardness is killed in battle. The whole career of Saul bears testimony to a system of temporal retribution. Throughout his reign, he was guilty of continual declensions from the law of that God who had given him the sceptre, and accordingly he was visited with frequent reverses, his unchecked passions distempered his mind, and sub-

jected him to seasons of madness and frenzy; his life is poisoned with jealousy, fear and remorse, and at length, when he had refused reproof and persisted in sin, he dies by his own hand on the field of battle. David is guilty of the heavy offences of adultery and murder; he is *expressly* punished by the death of the child, and there was a series of misfortunes from this time to the close of his reign, which were sent as further chastisements of his dark crimes. Jeroboam encouraged his people in the worship of idols, and, in consequence, the favor of the Lord departed from him and his household and kingdom. Ahab and Jezabel favored the false prophets, insulted the prophets of the Lord, practised oppression, fraud and cruelty, and they are notably punished for their dark offences; the one is slain in battle, the other is cast from her window and devoured by the dogs. The princes and the people in general have, through many generations, grievously departed from the law of the Lord: they are carried into captivity in Babylon, where, during seventy years, they endure all the bitter evils of exile, bondage and oppression. Nebuchadnezzar insults the majesty of heaven by his pride, ambition and ungodliness. He is cast down from his high place, and doomed during seven years to herd with the beasts of the field. Belshazzar, forgetful of the warnings and the judgments that befell his grandsire, exhibits the same overweening arrogance, conjoined with profligacy and profanity. Vengeance descends upon him in the hour of his loftiest pride and exaltation. As he sat in the midst of his nobles and captains, rioting in drunkenness, sacrilege and licentiousness, a spectral hand is seen

by him to write his doom in mystical characters on the wall. The sentence is expounded to him by the prophet of the Lord, and that very night his city is taken and sacked, he himself slain, and his kingdom given to another. Haman cherishes a deadly jealousy against the upright Mordecai, and carries his hatred so far as to erect a gallows on which he proposes to hang the object of his enmity. His dark schemes are discovered and turned against himself, and he and his sons are hanged on the gibbet which he had prepared for another." [1]

What a commentary this array of judgments and punishments on the truth of the apostle's declaration, that, under the old dispensation, "every transgression *received* a just recompense of reward."

Guided, therefore, by the Bible, and instructed by the providence of God, we warn every man of the swift retributions of sin; and endeavor to persuade all that the only way of life and peace and blessedness, is the way of obedience and righteousness. We proclaim to all men everywhere: "The wages of sin *is* death," and they are promptly paid. If you would not receive them, abandon the service of sin, and follow after holiness; for until you do this, you shall not see the Lord, nor enjoy his comfortable presence. Do this, and you shall have that peace which passeth knowledge; and the Holy Spirit, which is the Universal Comforter, shall come and dwell with you forever.

[1] "A System of Temporal Retribution indicated from Scripture and Observation." The author was formerly a Presbyterian Minister of Nova Scotia.

CHAPTER IX.

REPENTANCE AND FORGIVENESS AS RELATED TO SALVATION AND PUNISHMENT.

Repentance, in its relation to Salvation, is simply reformation, or that "godly sorrow" for sin which leads to its abandonment. It is not mere regret for wrong, but, through the help of the Holy Spirit, such a complete change of mind and heart, in regard to the exceeding wickedness of all disobedience, and the nature of wrong itself, that the heart and conscience turn from it with abhorrence. John Baptist preached, as the fore-runner of Jesus, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And the Saviour said, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the gospel." Mark i. 15. That is, Reform, for the kingdom of righteousness is about to be set up — abandon your sinful and wicked life, and prepare, by a change of faith, and heart, and conduct, to enter into its heavenly joys.

Paul says to the Corinthians, "I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance; for godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of." 2 Cor. vii. 8–11. Not sorrow only, not regret that they had suffered for their sin; but sorrow for the sin itself, and such sorrow that it led to a complete reformation, to an en-

ture change of heart and life, and consequent salvation from sin and from the love of it.

To the same point is the exhortation of Peter: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord," &c. Acts iii. 19. Reform, and be so thoroughly turned to God, that he may look upon you no longer as sinners, but as saved, having a new heart and a right spirit. "And John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Mark i. 4. The thought here is the same — such repentance as will put away sin entirely, and lead to a new life of holiness. And thus repentance and salvation touch each other at these points, and are identical.

Of course, presented in this Scriptural form, it is easy to see that repentance is necessary to salvation, to deliverance from sin; and that without repentance there can be no salvation, no conformity to the divine law of holiness. But, at the same time, we must remember that salvation is from sin, and not from punishment; and that repentance, therefore, is not security from punishment, not a way or a means of escape from the penalty of actual transgression.

Repentance leads to forgiveness, just as it leads to salvation; for forgiveness, as taught in the Bible, is forgiveness of sin, never of the punishment of sin. This is important, and is illustrated by such passages as these: "He is faithful and just to forgive us our *sins*." 1 John i. 9. "Thou hast forgiven *the iniquity* of thy people." Psalm lxxxv. 2. "And *their sins* shall be forgiven them." Mark iv. 12

"Blessed is he whose *transgression* is forgiven, whose *sin* is covered." Psalm xxxii. 1; Rom iv. 7. "Having forgiven you *all trespasses.*" Col. ii. 13. "I write to you, because *your sins* are forgiven." 1 John ii. 12. "Who forgiveth all thine *iniquities.*" Psalm ciii. 3. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of *sins.*" Acts v. 31. "Through him is preached unto you forgiveness of *sins.*" iii. "In whom we have forgiveness of *sins.*" Eph. i.; Col. i.

These texts are proofs of the position that the Scriptural doctrine of forgiveness is not remission of punishment, but of the sin which brings punishment. We are punished for sins already committed, but we are forgiven the evil heart, the wicked passions which lead to the commission of them.

And this truth is clearly set forth in such testimony as this: "The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, *and that will by no means clear the guilty.*" Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7. Nothing can be more directly to the point, than this declaration, that the guilty are both punished and forgiven; that it is iniquity, transgression, and sin, which are forgiven, and not the consequences or penalty of these.

Hence God says to the prophet Isaiah, "Comfort ye my people, speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that *her iniquity is pardoned; for she has received at the Lord's hand, double for all her sins.*" xl. 1, 2. It is impossible to state the matter in more positive

terms than these. Jerusalem had been punished severely, terribly for *all* her sins, and at the same time we are told that she was pardoned or forgiven — but what was forgiven? "Her iniquity," or the sin which brought upon her these judgments of the Lord. And without question, the very punishment she suffered was one of the agencies by which this forgiveness was accomplished.

What, then, is the meaning of forgiveness? The original word is ἀφιημι, *aphiemi*, in its verbal form, and ἄφεσις, *aphesis*, in its substantive form. The italicized words, in the following texts, are renderings of the original terms: "Then Jesus *sent* the multitudes *away*." Matt. xiii. 36. And in 1 Cor. vii. 12, it is applied to the divorce or *putting away* of a wife. In Luke iv. 18, it occurs twice, translated by the English words "deliverance" and "liberty," — "to preach *deliverance* to the captives, and to set at *liberty* them that are bruised.

The simple meaning, therefore, of the term "forgiveness," is *putting or sending away*, *removal*, or *deliverance from*; and "forgiveness of sin," is removal of sin, or deliverance from sin. From this point the subject becomes intelligible. The sin is punished and forgiven — the penalty of transgression is inflicted; and then the sinner is forgiven, or delivered from his sinful course, his evil heart of wickedness. And the very punishment itself, is conducive to this forgiveness, on this putting away of sin. Subdued and humbled by the just judgments of God, he reflects upon his ways, is brought to repentance, abandons his wicked life, and thus his sins are dismissed, put away, forgiver; he is set at liberty, or

delivered from them; or, in other words, he is *saved* — not from punishment, but from sin.

This is clearly and beautifully illustrated in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, which we may be permitted to introduce again to aid us in understanding this important subject. He was guilty of great folly and wickedness, and he was sorely punished for it: he suffered terribly for the wrong he had done. This suffering, this punishment, at last brought him to repentance; he abandoned his sinful life, or, what is the same thing, his sins were forgiven or put away; he was saved from them, and returned to his father's house, to obedience and happiness. He did not by his repentance escape the punishment of his past transgression; but he did escape from his sins, and from the punishment which would have followed a continuance in them. The steps in his fall and rise were these: 1. Temptation. 2. Sin. 3. Punishment. 4. Repentance. 5. Forgiveness. 6. Salvation. Every one who has sinned, and abandoned his sins, can understand this process, this inward experience, without any learned theological treatise on the metaphysical relations of these various steps to each other.

No repentance can save from the just penalty of the violated law. The hand thrust into the fire is burned, and no regret, no sorrow, however sincere, can save from the pain; but it may save from a repetition of the act, and so save from the repetition of the pain. The repentance of the drunkard does not save him from the past shame and degradation and torment of his transgressions. He has not been a drunkard all these years without suffering the loss of honor and place, of the respect of his neighbors,

of his own respect; without humiliation, disgrace and remorse. He cannot be forgiven these; but his repentance will save him from the sin of drunkenness, and thus, the sin being forgiven, from a continuation of the punishment.

We turn now to another element involved in the idea of forgiveness, viz.: the re-instatement of the sinner in the position he occupied before his transgression. The party against whom the sin has been committed regards the offender as though the sin had not been committed. On his repentance and return the father received the prodigal as if he had never wandered, with the same welcome and affection as before his transgression. His sin was blotted out, and no longer remembered against him.

The idea is expressed in such passages as these: "According unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions. . . . . Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities." Ps. li. 1, 9. "For I will be merciful to their righteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." Heb. viii. 12. That is, their sins and iniquities shall not be remembered *against* them; or, in the language of Ezekiel respecting the repentant sinner, "All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him." xviii. The same treatment shall be extended toward him, as if he had not transgressed; the same love shall embrace him after he has repented or reformed, which embraced him before he sinned.

And beside this, there is embodied in the idea of forgiveness that sense of release and freedom from the guilt and condemnation of sin, which is the natu-

ral consequence of a complete abandonment of it, and a fixed purpose to live a life of virtue and godliness. The former transgressor feels that the cloud which separated between him and God is passed away, and that he can again see the face of the Father, and rejoice in his approving smiles, and feel that sweet peace and satisfaction which are the reward of well-doing, of obedience and love.

It is from this point we see the meaning of these words of the Saviour: "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." Matt. vi. 14, 15. Hatred, a spirit of revenge, a hard and unforgiving temper, is itself a sin; and while we cherish it, we cannot have the approval of God, nor the peace and serenity of a kind and loving heart. No sin can be forgiven or put away, except upon repentance; and God will bless us with a sense of his comfortable presence, only on the condition that we abandon all wrong of conduct and feeling, and purify our hearts of all hatred and vindictiveness. So long as these evil passions are in the heart, we cannot be forgiven; or, in other words, the sin of them remains with us. "Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. Matt. v. 23, 24.

"Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." As we seek by our love and kindness to overcome and put away the hatred that is in the hearts of our

enemies, as we regard with favor those who repent of their wrong to us; so do thou, O Lord, by the power of thy love, by thy grace, subdue our hardness, remove our sinfulness, and restore us to the communion and fellowship of thy Holy Spirit.

The simple fact is this: We cannot, constituted morally and spiritually as we are now, be at peace with God till we are at peace with our brother. We cannot feel reinstated in the approbation and favor of our Father, against whom we have all sinned so much, until we freely forgive and restore to favor the penitent who have trespassed against us. Hatred, malice, revenge are themselves proof of our unforgiven condition; for forgiveness of sin is abandonment of sin, but the cherishing these evil feelings is itself a sin, and an evidence, therefore, that we have not abandoned it.

CHAPTER X.

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF DAMNATION.

SECTION I.

DEFINITION AND USAGE OF THE ORIGINAL WORDS.

The words "damn" and "damnation," are translations of several original words in the New Testament. In order to get at the true value and radical meaning of the terms, it will be necessary to present the Greek forms separately, with examples of the various English renderings.

I. *Κρινω—Krino.* This word occurs, in its simple form, one hundred and ten (110) times, in the New Testament, and is rendered "damn" once; in the compound form of *Κατακρινω* — *Katakrino*, nineteen (19) times, and is rendered "damn" twice. The three passages are the following: "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all may be damned (*krino*,) who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12. "He that believeth, and is baptised, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned," (*katakrino*,) Mark xvi. 16. "He that doubteth is damned (*katakrino*) if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; for whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." Rom. xiv. 23.

The exact weight which is to be attached to this

word "damned," as the English rendering of the original, will best be seen by adopting it as the translation in other passages where it occurs in the original, but is rendered into English by a different word. "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones *damning* the twelve tribes of Israel." Luke xxii. "He that believeth not, is *damned* already." John iii. "Doth our law *damn* any man, before it hear him?" vii. "Know ye not that we shall *damn* angels?" 1 Cor. vi. "Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him (Jesus) and *damn* him according to your law." John xviii. "Woman, hath no man *damned* thee? .... Neither do I *damn* thee. Go, and sin no more." John viii. "Let not him who eateth not, *damn* him who eateth." Rom. xiv. "When Judas saw that he (Christ) was damned." Matt. xxvii. "Touching the resurrection of the dead, I am damned by you this day." Acts xxiv.

These texts are sufficient to show that the original word is not one specially employed to express the idea of punishment even, certainly not of endless punishment. And is it likely, if the doctrine of endless punishment be true, that the Holy Spirit would have chosen a word to express it so very elastic and indefinite as this? Is it reasonable to suppose that so tremendous a fact would be left to rest on so slight a foundation? on a Greek word, so doubtful that even the translators themselves have ventured to translate it "damnation" only three times, out of a usage of one hundred and twenty-nine times! And is there anything in these three texts which so distinguishes them from the other one hundred and twenty-six, as to lead us to believe they are specially

set apart as revelations of this terrible dogma? An examination of them, and a comparison with the rest, will furnish a ready and satisfactory answer to this question; and show that the simple idea is that of *judgment* or *trial;* and hence *decision* or *decree;* and from this, *condemnation, loss*, or *injury*, consequent upon any given action or conduct. Thus the evils or punishments, consequent upon unbelief, are described by this term. And he who eats meats forbidden by the law, or such as had been offered to idols, while doubtful of the propriety of it, or his conscience not approving, is condemned; on the ground that we should not do anything of the propriety and rightness of which we are doubtful. But in all this there is no allusion to future or endless damnation. The meaning is plain enough to those who wish to know the truth.

II. Κρισις — *Krisis.* This word is found forty-eight (48) times in the New Testament, and is translated three times *damnation*, twice *condemnation*, twice *accusation*, and in every other instance, *judgment.* The passages where it is rendered by the word "damnation," are Matt. xxiii. 33, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Mark iii. 29, He who blasphemes against the Holy Ghost, "is in danger of eternal damnation;" John v. 29, "The resurrection of damnation."

The same idea pervades the substantive usage of the word, which marked the verbal form; and the three English words chosen by our translators, to represent its meaning, well express its development. *First*, "accusation," or the charge or indictment against the offender for the violation of the law.

Second, "judgment," or trial of the accused, the proceedings necessary to conviction. *Third*, "condemnation," or "damnation," consequent upon conviction; the punishment of the transgressor according to the demands of Government and the Law.

Of course, there is nothing in this which would lead any one to suppose that this accusation, judgment, conviction, and condemnation, or damnation, can only take place in some other world than this. The word in the original is constantly applied to the things of this world, to men in the flesh; and when used in connection with transgressors of the moral law, implies the infliction of the penalty, or damnation, where and when the offence is committed. What the damnation is, is determined entirely by the nature of the offence. The damnation of unbelief, is the condition itself, and the consequences of unbelief, the darkness, and gloom, and torment, which are the fruit of it. "He that believeth not, is damned already; and this is the damnation, that men have loved (or chosen) darkness rather than light." John iii. But the damnation of the "Scribes, Pharisees, and hypocrites," who were full of all manner of wickedness and corruption, was seen in the terrible calamities which fell on them in the overthrow and destruction of their nation.

III. Κριμα — *Krima*. This word occurs twenty-eight (28) times, and is translated "damnation" seven times, as follows: Of the Pharisees it is said, because of their greater wickedness, "therefore, ye shall receive the greater damnation." Matt. xxiii., Mark xii., Luke xx. "Whose damnation is just." Rom. iii. Those who resist the civil power "shall

receive to themselves damnation." Rom. xiii. "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." 1 Cor. xi. Certain widows in haste to marry, do so, "having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith." 1 Tim. v. 12.

Unfortunately for the English reader, the translators of the Bible have, in very many important cases, confounded the duty of translator with that of interpreter or commentator. Instead of selecting the best English term, to represent a given Hebrew or Greek word, and preserving a uniform translation; they have undertaken, too often, to decide for the reader what this or that passage or expression, means as regards doctrine. In respect to the word now in review, as well as those already considered, instead of simply translating it by some one English term, and leaving the reader to compare all the texts, and thus decide for himself its true signification; they have varied its translation according to their own creeds or opinions, and taken upon themselves to determine the doctrine of the passages where it occurs.

For example, suppose we had "damnation" in the following passages as the translation of *krima;* then by comparing it with the seven texts already given, the reader could judge for himself, whether the original contained in itself, or was ever employed to express, the idea of endless torment after death. Speaking of the Saviour, the disciples say: "The chief priests, and our rulers, delivered him to be damned to death," — *literally*, "to the damnation of death." What damnation means here, is defined by the sentence itself, viz: death by crucifixion. And

the thief rebuked his companion, "Dost thou not fear God, seeing thou art in the same damnation?" i. e. of death. "For damnation I am come into this world." John ix. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his damnations, and his ways past finding out." Rom. xi. And this immediately after announcing the goodness of God in the final restoration of the Jews and Gentiles! What can be more decisive against the common interpretation of the word "damnation?" Is it likely that any such thought was associated with the term in the mind of the apostle? If so, would he not have chosen some other term for expressing his wonder and joy, in view of the great ingathering of Jews and Gentiles through the grace of God?

"For the time is come that damnation must begin at the house of God (the Christians); and if it first begin with us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" 1 Pet. iv. 17. In this case the damnation began with the godly, and ended with the ungodly, and was the same in both cases. And it is to be noted that this was 1800 years ago; for the apostle says, "The time *is* come (i. e. when he was writing,) that damnation must begin at the house of God." The damnation was the suffering to which the Christians were subjected by the persecutions of the Jews; and the calamities which afterward came upon the Jews themselves, and swept them away in the whirlwind of God's judgment, the great day of his wrath. Gilpin, of the English Church, has ex-

actly expressed the meaning: "Thus, amidst the general ruin which is coming upon these wicked times, the Christian shall have his share. But his afflictions will be light, in comparison of that great overthrow which shall destroy the Jewish nation."[1]

These passages are enough to discover to us the meaning and usage of the words translated "damn" and "damnation" in the New Testament. And nothing can be plainer to the honest and unprejudiced mind, than that the original Greek words never had associated with them the same horrible ideas, which are so universally attached to the English words. It is not possible to believe that if the disciples, or the people of that age, had commonly employed the words *krino*, *krima*, *krisis*, in the sense in which the majority of Christians now employ the words *damn* and *damnation*, that they would so often and so freely have applied them to Jesus.

Considering the present popular use of the words, it would be painful and offensive to talk of Christ's being damned, or of his being delivered to the damnation of death. Yet the evangelists say these things without any hesitation or explanation; showing thereby that they did not connect with the words the errors and revolting dogmas of modern Christians. There is nothing in any of the passages where the Greek words occur, however translated, to lead us to imagine that they ever thought of any suffering or punishment beyond this life. They employed them in reference to human tribunals and punish-

[1] PAIGE'S Selections, where it will be seen that the same view is taken by other eminent orthodox commentators, as WHITBY, MACKNIGHT, LIGHTFOOT, the Catholic CALMET, &c.

ments; to describe the consequences of unbelief, of blindness of mind and hardness of heart; to designate those judgments of God upon individual and national wickedness, which they saw themselves in this world, and which were visible to all who had eyes to see.

And it cannot but commend itself to every careful thinker, that where such tremendous interests are at stake, the Holy Spirit would certainly be direct and positive in the statement of the matter. Surely, if it were intended that the terrible fact of a future life of endless woe and torment should be revealed as a warning to the race, as the foreordained lot of the wicked, then God would have chosen for its revelation terms more precise and exclusive in their signification than any of those we have examined. Nay, is not a subject of such vast moment to all mankind, worthy of a language of its own? If it be true that any are to be "damned" in the sense of infinite, unending misery, and true that all are in danger of it, would not the Spirit consecrate to the special revelation of this awful fact, words and phrases never to be used for any other purpose? Where it is of such immense importance that all possibility of mistake should be excluded, would not God take out, and set apart, from all other human language, the specific terms to be used in announcing and enforcing this dreadful truth? and say to all the world, —

"*These are the words and phrases in which this doctrine is to be taught — they are sacred to this purpose. Whenever, therefore, they appear on the pages of Inspiration, let it be known, at once, of all men, that they mean this, and never anything but this, viz:*

A LIFE ACCURSED OF GOD; A FUTURE LIFE OF TORMENT WITHOUT MEASURE AND WITHOUT END!"

A matter of such fearful interest to the entire race of man, demanded something of this sort. We have a right, when the whole infinite sweep of our future being is concerned, to expect that a just God, not to say a merciful Father, would be thus explicit and positive in the terms chosen for the revelation of endless punishment. And had he done this, which it was so easy to do, then all argument and debate, all criticism and doubt, would have been shut out from the beginning. And since he has not done what it was so easy to do, and what justice demanded, there is but one lawful inference, but one conclusion permitted us, and that is, that he never intended to reveal such a doctrine, simply because it is not true.

SECTION II.

RESURRECTION OF DAMNATION — AWAKING TO SHAME AND EVERLASTING CONTEMPT.

There is one passage which may be thought to conflict with the doctrine of the preceding section, inasmuch as it speaks of a damnation in connection with the resurrection; coming, in fact, after the resurrection. Not *the* resurrection, we might reply, but *a* resurrection. This passage, with its correlative in Daniel, will now receive attention.

[1] ATHANASE COQUEREL, the distinguished Protestant preacher of Paris, says: "Who will believe that the eternity of punishment, a doctrine of such terrible and grave importance, can depend, in any sense, upon trifles of criticism, upon variations of translation? It is a first legitimate prejudice against such a dogma, the necessity of giving it such support; and I cannot but think that, if it was taught in the Gospel, it would be done with a clearness so terrible that we should all tremble at it, but not dispute it."

"Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John v. 28, 29.

That the Saviour is speaking here of a moral or spiritual, and not of a literal resurrection, is plain enough from the entire context; and if so, the damnation is in this world, and not in the immortal world to which a literal resurrection introduces us. "Marvel not at *this*." What? The declaration he had just made, — "Verily, I say unto you the hour is coming, *and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." Here was a resurrection which had actually commenced; and the only difference between this and that mentioned in verses 28, 29, was that the first was partial, and the other universal. Both were moral, a resurrection from ignorance, unbelief and spiritual darkness, to knowledge, faith and spiritual light and life. consequent upon the preaching of Christ. The terms set over against each other as equivalents, show this—"the dead" in the one, being those that "are in the graves" in the other; and coming forth to "the resurrection of life" in one, answering to "shall live" in the other.

And the parallel is seen still farther in the statement preceding these, in verse 24 — "Verily I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but *is passed* from death unto life." Here "life," or "everlasting life," is

something already possessed by the believer; and it is set against "condemnation," which is the equivalent of the "damnation" in verse 29, showing that both texts refer to the same kind of a resurrection, one actually begun, the other about to begin. The expression, "*is* passed from death to life," shows that the "death" and the "life," and the resurrection or the passing from one to the other, are all figurative, and not literal, — something which takes place while the persons are yet in the body; the resurrection being the result of faith in Christ.

And the same idea is re-stated in even stronger language in chapter xi. 25, 26: "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, *shall never die.*" Now that Christ is here speaking of moral or spiritual life and death, is proved by the fact that those who believe on him do die naturally; and also by the fact that the literally dead do not rise or live *because* they believe in Christ — otherwise, only believers would have a resurrection. But the dead spoken of here are raised to life by faith or belief in Christ; while those living and believing in him never die the death here spoken of. It is plain, therefore, that the terms are used figuratively — "death" representing a state of unbelief and spiritual blindness; and "life," or the coming forth to life, the opposite of this.

The expression "in the graves" is no stronger than the phrase "the dead." But if it were, its counterpart is found where it cannot possibly refer to the literally dead, in such passages as the following: "And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones

live? And I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest. . . . So I prophesied as I was commanded, and as I prophesied there was a noise, and behold! a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone. . . . And the sinews and the flesh came upon them, and the skin covered them, . . . and the breath came into them, and they lived and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army! Then he said unto me, Son of man, *these bones are the whole house of Israel.* Therefore prophesy, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land." Ezekiel xxxvii.

Here the prophet represents the political overthrow of the Jews, and their captivity in Babylon, under the figure of being dead and in their graves; and their deliverance from captivity and restoration to their own land, as a resurrection, a coming forth to life. And the Saviour represents the gross darkness and unbelief of the Jews and Heathen, under the figure of being dead and in their graves; and their awakening from this state through the preaching of the Gospel, under the figure of a resurrection.[1] Those who,

[1] The same figure is common with us, as the following from WATTS will show:—

"But where the Gospel comes,
It sheds diviner light,
It calls *dead* sinners from their *tombs*,
And gives the blind their sight."

in this state of ignorance and darkness, had followed what light they possessed, and done good as far as they knew, on hearing the voice of the Son of man, or the Gospel, would find their conduct approved, and would rejoicingly come forth from the grave of ignorance and unbelief to a resurrection of life; but those who had done evil, hearing the searching truths of the Gospel would find their evil deeds reproved, and would come forth to the resurrection of damnation. For example: Cornelius, while dead, or in the grave of pagan ignorance, did good as far as he knew, lived a life of charity and love; hence, when he heard the voice of the Son of man in the truth preached by Peter, he came forth to the resurrection of life. In other words, the Gospel approved his conduct, and God blessed him for his faithful improvement of his one talent. On the other hand, the Pharisees, Priests and Scribes came forth at the voice of the Son of man, to the resurrection of damnation, for the false, hypocritical and wicked life they had lived, though the very oracles of God were in their keeping. The same thing, in fact, we see now, every day, where the Gospel is preached to the mixed multitude of good and evil men. "He that believeth not *is condemned* (damned) *already*" by the truth. "And *this* is the condemnation, (or damnation, the same original word which occurs in the phrase 'resurrection of damnation,') that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." John iii. 18, 19.

These various testimonies establish the fact that the death, resurrection, life and damnation here spoken of are all realized in this world, while yet in the

lesh; and therefore, that Christ is not speaking of a literal resurrection, nor of a damnation to come after the soul enters the spiritual world.

And now let us proceed to notice the passage in Daniel, where, though the words "damnation" and "resurrection" do not occur, we find what are, perhaps, their equivalents — "awaking from the dust, and "everlasting contempt." And since the text is put down in the margin of all our Bibles as parallel with the preceding, and the resemblance in language and metaphor is so marked, it seems fitting to give it an examination here.

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt." xii. 2. This is probably a prophetic description of what would take place when the old dispensation of the Law should be abolished, and the new dispensation of the Gospel set up in its place. The thought is precisely that of John v. just reviewed; only that the prophet seems to have more special reference to the Jews, while the Saviour, who doubtless had the language of Daniel in mind, extends the application to Jews and Gentiles alike.

The meaning of the phrase, "sleeping in the dust of the earth," is the same as that of our Lord, "all that are in the graves"; indicating a state of spiritual sloth, stupidity, ignorance and unbelief. And the time of awaking from this, or of the resurrection here intimated, is definitely fixed by a comparison of the words of the prophet with those of the Saviour in Matt. xxiv.

Daniel says, "And there shall be a time of trouble,

such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time; and *at that time* thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." xii. 1–3. And in verse 11 he speaks of the time when "the abomination that maketh desolate shall be set up." This is the connection; and it will be seen that this awaking to "everlasting life" and "everlasting shame and contempt," was to take place when there should be a time of trouble such as never was before, and the abomination of desolation should be set up in the holy place.

Now the Saviour refers to this very language of the prophet, and fixes its fulfilment at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem and the abolition of the Law dispensation. Speaking of this event, he says: "When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains — (if the end of the material world were meant, what security would it give to flee into the mountains? It is evident that the judgment referred to was the destruction of the city, fleeing from which into the country, or into the mountains, they would find refuge and safety) — for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time; no, nor ever shall be. . . . Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." Matt. xxiv. 15–34.

Daniel and the Saviour both speak of the abomination of desolation; and both speak of a time of trou-

ble or tribulation such as was never known before — and while Daniel says that this resurrection of some to "everlasting life," and of others to "shame and everlasting contempt," shall take place "*at that time*," the time of this great tribulation; Christ fixes "*that time*," by saying it should come before the generation then living passed away. And history records the truth of the declaration, by showing that within that period the Law was abolished and the Gospel kingdom set up; the faithful and believing entering into the freedom, security and joy of a new life, while their old persecutors and enemies fell into the "shame and everlasting contempt," the damnation of which Christ speaks in John, and which they still suffer, a by-word, a reproach and a hissing among the nations. And thus the words of Jesus in Matt. xxiii. 34, are exactly fulfilled: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape *the damnation* of hell? . . . That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth. . . . Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon *this generation*."

Substantially, therefore, the two passages under review refer to the same kind of a resurrection, and to the same kind of damnation. That of the prophet is more restricted in its purpose and application, being confined to a particular people and a particular event; while that of the Saviour refers not only to the people who then heard his voice, and to events then happening, but to all nations and all times where and when the Gospel should be preached.

CHAPTER XI.

EVERLASTING, ETERNAL, FOREVER, IN CONNECTION WITH PUNISHMENT.

SECTION I.

CLASSIC USAGE AND LEXICOGRAPHY.

It is worthy of note that the words *Αἰών* and *Αἰώνιος*, *everlasting*, *eternal*, *forever*, occur not less than one hundred and seventy-nine times in the New Testament, and yet are applied to punishment only *thirteen* times. The expression "everlasting punishment" is found once only, "eternal damnation" once only, "everlasting destruction" once only, and "everlasting fire" twice.

If these phrases do really set forth a life of endless pain, and Jesus came to announce this as the doom of the wicked, it is beyond measure astonishing that he should mention it in this form only once or twice in the whole course of his ministry! Yet this is the fact, according to Matthew and Mark; and if we had only the gospels of Luke and John, we should have no proof that he ever mentioned it at all, for they did not attach sufficient importance to the fact to record it in their account of his teachings! Is it reasonable to suppose that, if these phrases had such a terrible meaning, they would have forgotten or neglected to say that Christ uttered them? If they had under-

stood him to mean this, would not the special form of speech he used have graven itself into their memory?

And again: if the phrases in review were chosen of Jesus to express the dreadful doctrine of endless torment, is it probable that Paul, Peter and Jude would employ them only once in their epistles? and John and James not at all? Think for a moment of the faithful, earnest, out-spoken Paul, really believing in this doctrine, and believing that Christ taught it in the phrases "everlasting punishment" and "eternal damnation," and writing thirteen or fourteen epistles on religious doctrines, and preaching everywhere to Jews and Gentiles, and yet only once using this language! It is beyond belief.[1]

It must be confessed by every just-minded person, that these facts furnish a strong presumptive argument that the words and phrases are not employed in the Scriptures to describe a condition of unending suffering. They are in themselves weighty evidence that the Greek *αἰώνιος*, or the English "everlasting," is expressive of indefinite rather than endless time. And this brings us to the inquiry —

What is the meaning of the Greek Αἰών and Αἰώνιος, rendered "everlasting," "eternal," "forever," &c., in the New Testament?

Usage determines the meaning of words. Lexicographers do not create meanings or definitions, but *report* them as gathered from the usage of the popu-

[1] And the reply cannot be made here, that is sometimes offered in regard to the word *Gehenna* (hell,) that it is a Hebrew word, and therefore would not be understood by the Gentiles. The words reviewed in the text are pure Greek, and if the apostles had believed the doctrine of endless woe, and believed these words expressed it, they would doubtless have been in constant use.

lar writers, and standard authors, of the language. The only method of understanding the current and real value of the words in review, is to examine the writings of Greek authors, and learn how they used them, or what meaning was put upon them in the ordinary speech of the people. This our space will permit us to do only to a very limited extent; but the examples shall be fairly reported, from various sources, so that the reader may have materials for forming a correct judgment in the case.

Aristotle has been appealed to by Theologians as final authority in regard to the origin and meaning of these words. The substance of the passage so much relied on is that *aiōn* is composed of *aei* and *ōn*, signifying *always being;* or, perhaps, *continuous being*, and closes with the following: "And the infinite time of all things, and the period comprehending that infinity, is *aion*, deriving its name from *aei einai*. Whence also it appears that it is applied to other things, to some accurately, but to others in the lax signification of being, or even life." [1]

Now let us suppose that Aristotle intends to define *aion* and *aionios* as meaning primarily and radically infinite time, yet this does not settle the *usage* of the words, nor their meaning in the New Testament. And it is precisely at this point that theological critics have made their great mistake. *It is not the definition which the critic may force upon the words, or the philologist wring from their roots, but the popular sense and usage, that we have to deal with.* Christ did not preach to philosophers, scholars and critics,

[1] *De Cælo*, Lib. i. caput 9. See, also, *De Mundo*, cap. 11, where the definition is repeated.

familiar with all the niceties of lexicography, and all the delicate shades of definition grounded on the origin and composition of words; but to the common people speaking the language of common life, and familiar only with the ordinary meaning and popular use of words.

And even Aristotle himself, whatever his scholarly exegesis, shows in the very passage in which he gives it, what is the popular usage of the words. "For the period," says he, "which comprehends the time of every one's life, beyond which nothing exists according to nature, is called his *aion*"—i. e., his period, existence, being, life-time. This concedes all we ever claimed or asked. No matter whether this is a critically accurate use of the term or not; the only question is, Was it a current use? did the people employ it in this sense of indefinite time, or time limited by the subject to which it was applied? Aristotle himself answers the question, and shows us that the words were applied to persons and things, to periods and eras, temporary by their very nature, lasting longer or shorter, according to circumstances.

The same rule holds good in all languages. Even admitting the absolute definition, all words have a popular definition. Take the word "endless," or "infinite," or any similar term, and the fact will be obvious. How often we hear of "endless talkers," "an endless controversy," &c.; of "infinite folly," of the "infinite tenderness" of a mother for her offspring, of something "infinitely grand," or "infinitely beautiful." Now, suppose one should go into an elaborate argument, or a learned and critical exegesis, to prove that the primary and radical meaning

of the word was absolute infinity of time or measure. It would determine nothing as to their meaning in any given case. Here is a popular use of the words, and the meaning in any special case, limited or unlimited, must be determined by the subject and the connection. Common sense has more to do with it than philology.

But aside from this, a little examination will show that the very language in which the great philosopher has attempted his definition, discovers that the substantive meaning of the word is, after all, completeness of time or being, and not endless time. Observe how he connects his statements: "The period which comprehends the time of every one's life is called his *aion*" — and then immediately adds: "*For this reason, therefore*, the period of the whole heaven, even the infinite time of all things and the period comprehending that infinity, is *aion*, immortal and divine, deriving its name from *aei einai*." For *what* reason is infinite time or eternity called *aion?* Because, he says, "the period which comprehends the time of every one's life is called *his aion*" — therefore infinite time, or the period embracing the life of the universe, is called *its* AION.

The very structure of the sentence shows that the word designates the period or complete life of any person or thing, or the time of its being, whether longer or shorter; and therefore, as infinite time or eternity is the period of the heavens, or the time of their duration, it is called the immortal and divine *aion*. And the very use of the descriptive word "immortal," shows the necessity felt of adding strength to the meaning of *aion;* and establishes the fact that it

takes its meaning in this case, as in all others, from the subject, thing or person to which it is joined; and when applied to infinite time, takes the sense of eternity — is immortal or ever-enduring, *because* it is so applied.

And this position is singularly affirmed by Aristotle in another passage from the *De Mundo*, where he has the expression ἐξ ἀϊδίνος ἀτέρμονος εἰς ἕτερον αἰῶνα, "from one interminable *aion* to another *aion*." Now, if the radical meaning of the word is endless, or absolute eternity, why did he add another word to increase the force of it? What sense is there in saying "from one endless eternity to another endless eternity?" And even with the adjective "interminable," he does not express the idea of absolute eternity, duration without limit or end; otherwise there could not be "another" such period, which the sentence affirms!

So much, therefore, for Aristotle's famous definition, of which so great use has been made by theologians. His own usage is against his definition, and shows that however he wrote as a scholar and critic, he talked like other people, and used words in their popular sense.[1] And this is the real object of inquiry; the sense which *the people* put upon these words, the meaning attached to them in the ordinary

[1] There is another passage from ARISTOTLE curiously confirming the above. He is showing that "there are some difficult questions which we cannot with certainty answer," as for example — "whether the world is eternal or not," κόσμος ἄϊδιος ἢ οὐ. Now if Aristotle regarded *aionios* as the only proper word to express eternity, why did he not use it here? No doubt he is speaking here of absolutely endless duration; and yet, instead of employing *aionios* to express it, he selects a different word altogether, *aidios*. — *Tropic*, Lib. i. cap. xi., in *Grotius de Veritate*, Lib. i. § vii. *Note*.

business, social and religious conversation of the multitude.

That the popular sense of *aion* and *aionios* is that of indefinite time, limited and determined by the subject or connection, can be abundantly demonstrated. Every one familiar with Greek and Ecclesiastical literature knows this to be the case. The words constantly occur in this sense. Homer, Herodotus, Isocrates and Xenophen employ *aion* in the sense of the Latin *aevum*, the life of a man, his age, an age. Herodotus and Sophocles both have the expression *telutesai ton aiona*, "to end one's life," or die. In a poem, or Hymn to Jove, is found the phrase *o megistos aion*, "the greatest age or duration"; certainly not "the greatest eternity." Plato speaks of *methe aionios*, "constant drunkenness," not surely drunkenness lasting through eternity.[1] Diodorus Siculus has the phrase "*ton apeiron aiona*," "unlimited," or "indefinite time." But if *aion* is itself infinite time, where is the need of *apeiron?* It is the same with Aristotle's *atermonos*, both showing that *aion* requires the addition of an adjective, or its equivalent, to express absolute eternity.[2] Lexicographers universally recognize this every day sense of the words, some of them not even mentioning eternity as a meaning at all; while others give "age," or any complete period of time, without regard to its length, for the primary signification. As an example, *Donnegan* defines the words thus: "*Aion* — time; a space of

[1] STEPHENS' *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguæ*; ROBERT CONSTANT'S *Lexicon*. See, also, *Grotius de Veritate*, pp. 39, 315, and the notes and citations scattered through the book.

[2] *Diod. Sic.* i. 51. See the whole passage, where "the sepulchre," *aidious oikous*, is synonymous with *apeiron aiona en adou*—hades.

time; life-time and life; the ordinary period of a man's life; the age of man; man's estate; a long period of time; eternity; the spinal marrow; (*eis ton aiona*,) to a very long period, to eternity; (*apo aionos*, from, or in the memory of man.) *Aionios* — of long duration, eternal, lasting, permanent."

Schleusner, in his Lexicon of the New Testament, defines *Aion* as follows: "Any space of time, whether longer or shorter, past, present, or future, *to be determined by the persons or things spoken of, and the scope of the subjects;* the life or age of man; any space in which we measure human life, from birth to death." This is precisely our position; that the meaning of the word is to be determined by the scope of the subject, by the nature of the things or persons spoken of. If we speak of the *Aion* or "life time," of God, it takes on the meaning of absolute eternity, takes it from the very nature of God; but when we speak of the *aion* or life time of man, its meaning is bounded by his "three-score years and ten." Hence that Orthodox scholar and commentator, Macknight, says, "these words being ambiguous, are always to be understood according to the nature and circumstances of the things to which they are applied." And though he compels them into the service of endless punishment, he frankly says, "At the same time, I must be so candid as to acknowledge that the use of these terms, *forever*, *eternal*, and *everlasting*, in other passages of Scripture, show that they who understand them in a limited sense, when applied to punishment, put no forced interpretation upon them." [1] Olshausen is to the same point; that

[1] "Truth of the Gospel History," p. 28.

the word is ambiguous, and cannot be relied on in the argument for endless punishment.[1] And John Foster says, that "the terms do not necessarily and absolutely signify an interminable duration."[2]

These authorities prove that the central and *common* signification of the words is *indefinite*, and not endless, time. And I repeat and enforce the important point, that *this* is the meaning with which we have to do, if we would understand the New Testament. We are to inquire, not how Aristotle defines them, but how the people employed and understood them; for, as remarked, the sermons and addresses of Jesus were in the popular language of the day; and the New Testament was not written to scholars by scholars, but to the common people, by men mostly from their

[1] "Commentary on sin against the Holy Ghost." See also the Lexicons of ROBINSON, PICKERING, GROVE, and others.

[2] "Letter to a young Minister, on the duration of Future Punishment." DR. DODDRIDGE, so well known among "Evangelical" sects for his piety and learning, says: "We cannot pretend to decide *a priori*, or previous to the event, so far as to say that the punishments of hell must and will certainly be eternal;" by which he meant *endless*. Of course he did not believe that *aionios* meant endless, nor that the Bible revealed the doctrine; otherwise we could "pretend to decide." "*Before the event*"—what a curious idea! in other words, we cannot decide that they *will* suffer endlessly, until they *have* suffered endlessly—and as that time will never come, the doctrine can never be proved! *Theological Lectures*, Prop. 163. Dr. ISAAC WATTS, so celebrated for his hymns, was in doubt regarding the absolute eternity of punishment. He says: "I do not think we ought usually, when we speak concerning creatures, to affirm positively, that their existence shall be equal to that of the blessed God, *especially with regard to the duration of punishment.*"— *World to Come*, in his Works, i. 732. Edit. 1753. There is a look in this toward annihilation. SOUTHEY, in his Memoir of WATTS, thinks he agreed with ORIGEN and the Universalists in regard to punishment.— *Biblical Repos.* v. 253. *Sacred Classics*, ix. 59. See WHITTEMORE'S excellent Modern History for more concerning these eminent men, i. 211–216.

own number. And the next step will bring us still closer to this point.

SECTION II.

JEWISH-GREEK USAGE.

By the expression here employed, "Jewish-Greek usage," is intended, the use of these words by authors who were Jews by birth and religion, but who wrote in Greek. Of this number were Philo and Josephus, who, like Paul and Peter, and the Evangelists, were born and educated in the Jewish faith, but spoke and wrote in the Greek tongue. Josephus was contemporary with the apostles, and, therefore, is unquestionable authority for the popular usage of *aion* and *aionios*, in the times, and among the people of the New Testament. They occur frequently in his works, and are applied generally to the things of this life, to things or periods of comparatively short duration. Thus, he speaks of the everlasting (*aionios*,) reputation of Herod; of the *everlasting* memorial he raised to his name in re-building the temple, which "everlasting memorial" was destroyed when he wrote; of the *everlasting* worship of the temple, which he says, in the same sentence, had come to an end; of the *everlasting* name the patriarchs left behind them; of the *everlasting* glory of the Jewish nation; of the *everlasting* imprisonment to which the tyrant John was condemned by the Romans, &c. And he calls the period from the giving of the Law to the time he was writing a long *aion*. [1]

[1] *Expositor*, vol. iii. 7–10, & vol. i. 440, Against Appion, Lib. i., *Grotius de Veritate*, Lib. iii. § 16.

These examples show the common usage of the word *aionios*, "everlasting," and that Josephus, though a scholar, constantly employs the term in this popular sense. And Philo, who was also contemporary with the apostles, though his writings are more philosophical and abstruse, uses it in the same way. For example, he says of those who promise assistance and do not render it, that they expose themselves to "hatred and *everlasting punishment*" from those they injure, κόλασις ἀιώνιος, the very words used in Matt. xxv. 46, "these shall go away into everlasting punishment."[1] The everlasting punishment which the injured were able to inflict in such case, could not extend beyond this life; and so the example shows not only the current use of the word "everlasting," but also of the more important phrase, "everlasting punishment." So in speaking of the milk which nature prepares in the breast of the dam for her young, he calls it proof of an "everlasting and perfect sagacity." Of course, all he means by *aionios* in this case, is *far-reaching*, seeing a long way forward. And he employs the word, also, frequently, in the sense of *constant, continuous, uninterrupted.*

It is plain, therefore, from the writings of these two Jewish authors, who lived and wrote in the times of the New Testament, and one of them among the very people to whom it was addressed, that the words in review were in common use to express any length of time, longer or shorter, according to the circumstances; that they were continually applied to the persons, things and affairs of this world, to events

[1] *Fragmenta*, Tom. ii., Edit. 1742. *Universalist Quarterly*, vol. ii 132-136.

or conditions whose duration was bounded by the limits of this life.[1]

SECTION III.

USAGE OF THE CHURCH FATHERS.

Under this head I shall present a few examples from the early Fathers of the Church. *Ignatius* has the following, in speaking of the Saviour, ἐφανερώθη τοῖς αἰῶσιν, "he was manifested to the ages," certainly not to the "eternities." And this plural form is frequent among all Greek writers, classic, New Testament, and ecclesiastical. *Eusebius*, the historian, speaking of the Phœnician philosophy as set forth by Sanchoniathon, says of the darkness and chaos which preceded creation, "these were infinite (ἄπειρα,) and for a long time (διὰ πολὺν αἰῶνα,) had no limits." It is plain that the word is here used in its popular sense of indefinite time; otherwise *polun*, which signifies *great, much, long*, would be absurd. Beside, it is employed to designate a period which, though it may have had no beginning, came to an end on the morning of creation. Aristotle calls the entire period of the universe, or infinite time, *aion*. Now, if we translate this "eternity," Eusebius corrects the translation by giving the

[1] There is a passage in a Jewish work cited in STEPHEN'S *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguæ* as in *Solom. Parab.*, in which this sentence occurs, illustrating the common usage: "And these they called eternal, ἀιωνιους, hearing that they had performed the sacred rites for *three generations*, τριων γενεων. Here we have an eternity measured by three generations, or about a hundred years. Absolutely, *aionios* is indefinite duration; but in this case it is employed relatively, and therefore definitely, being limited by the specification of three generations.

same name to a part only of that period or duration, viz: that which preceded the creation! And from this we learn that "eternity" is the thing itself, and *aion* only the name of it. "Eternity," in its absolute sense, means one thing only, but the "name," *aion*, may mean many things. "Eternity" may be *aion*, but *aion* is not, therefore, necessarily "eternity." A house is a building, but every building is not a house. So much for definitions, and learned exegesis. The simple truth is, as remarked, that the people's usage is the only one which is of any importance in this inquiry. And this ordinary meaning of Eusebius is common in the New Testament, where the writers speak with equal freedom of the beginning and the end of *aions;* or eternities, if we insist on this definition. Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20; 1 Cor. x. 11; Heb. ix. 26.

The fact of this popular usage, and the certainty of *aion* and *aionios* meaning indefinite, and not endless duration, is put beyond controversy by the writings of the early Greek authors, who were known to be Universalists, or believers in the final restoration.

1. The *Sibylline Oracles* teach, in the most positive manner, that the damned will finally be delivered from the torments of hell; and yet they repeatedly describe these torments by the phrases "everlasting fire," and "eternal torments," thus discovering the meaning this language bore in the people's speech of that day — A. D. 150.

2. *Origen*, the greatest scholar of his age, in his writings and public lectures taught the final redemption of all in Christ; taught it with every variety of argument and illustration. But, at the same time,

he uses the same language employed in the New Testament, to describe the punishment of the wicked, "everlasting (*aionios*) destruction," "eternal damnation," &c., showing clearly enough that he did not understand these Scriptural phrases in the sense of endless. And surely, being a Greek himself, constantly among the people, preaching to them, and expounding the Scriptures to them every day, no better witness can be summoned to prove what meaning the phrases bore in the every-day speech of the people. He tells them that the wicked will suffer "everlasting punishment;" and yet, without any explanation, without appearing to think any is required, he proceeds to prove that this punishment will come to an end, and the wicked be restored!

3. *Gregory Nyssen* takes the same course in regard to the words. For example: he argues that "evil shall at length be wholly exterminated, and divine, immortal goodness, embrace within itself every rational creature; so that of all who were made by God, not one shall be excluded from his kingdom. All the viciousness, that like a corrupt matter is mingled in things, shall be dissolved and consumed in the furnace of purgatorial fire; and everything that had its origin from God, shall be restored to its pristine state of purity."[1]

And yet, like Origen, he constantly speaks of this "purgatorial fire" as *aionios*, "everlasting." For instance, he says, "whoever considers the divine power, will plainly perceive that it is able at length to restore, by means of the *everlasting* purgation and expiatory sufferings, those who have gone even to

[1] Ancient History of Universalism, chapters iv. & vi.

this extremity of wickedness." No language could be invented more conclusive than this. He not only says that this everlasting punishment shall end, but that it is *by means* of this everlasting punishment that the sufferers shall be restored! What does Aristotle's critical definition weigh in the scale against such usage as this in writings addressed to the people, to the world which Christ came to instruct and save?

Let these testimonies from the early church suffice. Others might be added, but these are enough for our purpose. Let the honest seeker after truth, remember that these men were Greeks by birth, and may justly be presumed to understand their own language — and that they use the very words of the New Testament, "everlasting," "eternal," "for ever," &c., in connection with punishment which they declare will end in the purification and redemption of those enduring it — nay, repeatedly affirm even that this eternal fire itself is the appointed means of purification!

SECTION IV.

SCRIPTURAL USAGE.

As already remarked, the New Testament abundantly confirms the fact of this popular sense of *aion*, and shows that the thought is not endless duration, but time indefinite, limited by the conditions of the case. Thus we have "this *aion*," and "the *aion* to come," "the beginning" and "the end of *aion*," and "*aion* and beyond." "That in the *aions* to come, he might show the exceeding riches of his

grace." Eph. ii. 7. "To make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the *aion* had been hid in God." Eph. iii. 9. "Eternal (*aionios*) life, which God promised *before* the eternal (*aionios*) times began." Titus i. 2. English translation — "before the *world* began." Here is "eternal life" promised before the beginning of a period, which is also called "eternal." "Tell us when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and *the end* of the world," *aion*. Matt. xxiv. 3. "Lo, I am with you always, even to *the end* of the *aion*." xxviii. 20. "But now once in *the end* of the world (*aion*) hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. ix. 26. Once more: "And they are written for our admonition, upon whom *the ends* of the worlds (*αἰώνων*) have come." 1 Cor. x. 11. Suppose we insist that *aion* radically signifies "eternity," on the authority of Aristotle, and translate accordingly "the ends of eternities." It would be confusion to affirm that *aion* is "absolute eternity;" then to talk of several *aions*, or periods of this sort; and then say that *the ends* of them all *have* come — and all this in the same sentence![1]

The following, from Prof. Stuart, will confirm the

[1] Mr. GOODWIN, in a series of learned and thoroughly exhaustive articles on the meaning of *aion*, in the *Christian Examiner* from 1828 to 1833, says: "This word expresses the existence of being alone." Though he might not accept all his criticisms and conclusions, the student will be profited by the perusal of these dissertations, and will be taught to what valuable uses sound learning may be put. See, also, an article in the January number of the Universalist Quarterly for 1847, and several other articles in the various volumes of this work, and of the Universalist Expositor.

foregoing statements respecting the meaning of the term, and its use in the New Testament:

"*Aion* in the New Testament, most usually means an indefinite, unlimited period of time; whereas, in the classics, the sense of *ævum*, *seculum*, "age," "generation," in respect to time, appears to be its most usual meaning. The most common and appropriate meaning of *aion* in the New Testament, and the one which corresponds with the Hebrew word *olim*, and which, therefore, deserves the first rank in regard to order, I put down first; an indefinite period of time, time without limitation; ever, forever, time without end, eternity; all in relation to future time. .... The different shades by which the word is rendered, depend on the object with which *aion* is associated, or to which it has relation, rather than to any difference in the real meaning of the word. .... The question when the words are to have the meaning of absolute eternity, or when the sense of ancient, or very old, is always to be determined by the nature of the case, i. e. by the context."[1]

And how abundantly this definition is sustained by the Scriptures, will further appear in such texts as follow, where the Hebrew equivalents of *aion* and *aionios* occur. "God will establish Jerusalem *forever*." Ps. xlviii. And yet he has twice destroyed it since this promise was made, showing that the "forever" means not endless, but indefinite time. "I will give thee the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession;" and yet he has cast them out from it eighteen hundred years ago. The covenant of circumcision is declared

[1] STUART'S Letters to MILLER, p. 128, and Exegetical Essays, Sec. 4 *Meaning of Aion.*

to be "an everlasting covenant," though it was abolished by Jehovah himself. And the priesthood of Aaron was set up on divine authority, as "an everlasting priesthood," and yet by that very authority it was abolished nearly two thousand years since, and the priesthood of Jesus set up in its place. Gen. xvii., xlviii., Exod. xl. So the sacrifice of atonement is pronounced "an everlasting statute," though it lasted only through the Law dispensation, and then gave place to the atonement of Christ. Levit. xvi.

Now, it is plain that the sacred record could not employ the word "everlasting" in these cases, in the sense of strict eternity; otherwise we are forced into conclusions which may well shock the piety of all who trust in the veracity of God, and rely upon the certain fulfilment of his promises. The obvious meaning of the word, in these Scriptures, is duration not limited by any specifications, but determined only by the circumstances. This will be further illustrated in the following:

"The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein forever." Ps. xxxviii. "Thou shalt take an awl, and thrust it through his ear into the door, and he shall be thy servant forever." Deut. xv. "They shall be your bondmen forever." Lev. xxv. In these cases the length of the "forever" is determined by the conditions of the question, and cannot extend beyond the life of man. It may last only a few years or days, depending on the health and life of the servant. Again: "Out of the belly of hell, cried I. . . . . The earth was about me with her bars forever." Jonah ii. Here the word "forever" is applied to a punishment which lasted only *seventy-*

two hours! And it is farther described as being in hell, thus showing that one may be punished in hell forever, and yet suffer only three days and nights! Nothing can better illustrate the elastic meaning of the terms, nor more conclusively show the folly of attempting to build the tremendous structure of strictly endless torment on such slender foundations! And these examples are but a few out of multitudes that might be cited. [1]

The result of our inquiry, then, respecting the words rendered "everlasting," "eternal," "forever," &c., is, that their popular, and without doubt their primary, meaning, is an *an indefinite period of time;* or, in other words, *duration without any limitations*, its length being determined by the subject, or the connection, varying from one day to eternity in its largest definition.

In order, therefore, to prove that the terms mean strictly *endless* when applied to punishment, it must be shown that punishment is as necessarily endless as

[1] I have not separately criticised the Hebrew words rendered "everlasting," "forever," &c., because it is universally agreed that they are the exact equivalents of *aion* and *aionios*, as the above quotations from the Old Testament show. And the Septuagint confirms this by translating the Hebrew words almost uniformly by the Greek; the exceptions being only 20 out of more than 300 examples. What is true, therefore, of one, is true of the other. Dr. TAYLOR, a profound Hebrew scholar, having also written the Hebrew Bible three times with his own hand, says of *oulm*, "it signifies a duration which is concealed, as being of an unknown or great length. It signifies eternity, not from the proper force of the word, but when the sense of the place, or the nature of the subject requires it, as God and His attributes." PARKHURST says, "it seems to be much more frequently used for *indefinite*, than for infinite time." Like their Greek synonyms, therefore, they borrow, rather than impart, the meaning of endless, though often used in this sense.

the being or attributes of God. To the scholar there is no more weight or meaning in the expressions "everlasting punishment," "eternal damnation," "everlasting destruction;" than in those other expressions, "an everlasting covenant," which he knows has been annulled; or the "eternal excellency" of the Jewish nation, which long ago ceased to be; or the "everlasting statute" which God himself abolished. There is nothing in the nature or object of punishment, which should make it more enduring than the covenant of God. And what is there in the threat of "everlasting shame and contempt" against the wicked Jews, that should make it more than the promises of "eternal excellency" to the same people? And if one is not of endless duration, why should we suppose the other to be? It is said of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, that "it shall never be forgiven." So it is said, "My people (the Jews,) shall never be ashamed;" and yet, as already quoted, it is also said they shall awaken to "everlasting shame." And it is written of the fire on the altar, that "it shall *never* go out," but fire and altar were swept away ages since. And God says: "David shall *never* want a man to sit upon the throne of Israel," and yet the family and the throne of David were blotted out centuries ago, and Israel itself scattered like *chaff* in the wind. Levit. vi. 13; Joel ii. 26, 27; Jer. xxxiii. 17.

And so of every phrase or form of speech, in which the original words are found in connection with punishment. "The smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever." The Bible student sees nothing in this to lead him to suppose it is to

last through all eternity, more than the fiery judgment which fell on Idumea, of which it is said, "the smoke thereof shall go up *forever*, none shall pass through it *forever and ever*," (Isa. xxxiv. 10,) though the destruction which wasted the people was comparatively brief, and thousands have passed through the land since. So of the expression, "shall be tormented day and night forever and ever;" for we find it written also, "I will cause you to dwell in this place, in the land I gave your fathers, *forever and ever*," (Jer. vii. 7,) and at the same time the stubborn fact looks us in the face that the Lord himself cast them out of the land! And yet no explanation is given, no intimation that there is any contradiction in this usage of the words; as there certainly would be if the meaning was strictly endless duration.

Thus proof on proof, in every variety of phrase compels us to caution in defining the exact meaning of these terms, and forbids the assumption that eternity only is the true measure of their value. And so far from there being any evidence that the divine punishment of sin is of such a nature, that the words, when applied to it, must of necessity mean endless, the whole burthen of the Scriptures, and the very word "punishment," as shown in a former chapter, declare in unmistakable terms that all punishment is, in its nature and purpose, temporary and remedial, and will end in the purification of the sufferer.

But one point more remains to be noticed. It is urged with great earnestness that the Saviour, in Matt. xxv. 46, applies *aionios* both to the punishment of the wicked and the life of the righteous, and that "if one is limited the other must be also"; that

if the "everlasting punishment" is not endless, then the "eternal life" is not.[1]

But let us apply this rule of criticism. "He stood and measured the earth, ... and the everlasting mountains were scattered, ... his ways are everlasting." Hab. iii. 6. Here the prophet attaches the same word "everlasting" to the hills and to God; and this in the same sentence, setting the one over against the other — so that if the one is limited, the other must be also; if the hills are not endless in duration, neither is God! Such reasoning is its own refutation.[2]

No reasonable person would be willing to allow, because he speaks of a "wise God" and "a wise

[1] This argument urged so confidently, is as old as Augustine (A. D. 400), who seems first to have brought it forward. And yet there is a passage in the *Civitate Dei* xxi. 16, which goes largely toward softening this special plea, by defending the doctrine of degrees in the punishments of the damned. "Nequaqam tamen negandum est, etiam ipsum æternum ignem pro diversitate meritorum quamvis malorum aliis leviorem, aliis futurum esse graviorem; *sive ipsius vis atque ardor pro pœna digna cujusque varietur, sive ipse æqualiter ardeat, sed non æquali molestia sentiatur.*" That is, the fires of hell will be graduated to the wickedness of the sufferers, touching some more lightly and others more severely; or, if they burn with equal fierceness for all, they will not be felt with equal pain by all; by which argument, as HAGENBACH says, AUGUSTINE "*admitted a relative cessation of damnation.*" — *Hist. of Doct.*, § 142. AUGUSTINE believed also in degrees of happiness in heaven; and taking this with his just tenderness toward the damned, we cannot but feel that the outer edge of heaven and the outer edge of hell must meet and touch. For, in such case, surely, the difference between the enjoyment of the least saint in heaven and the suffering of the least sinner in hell, is not worth mentioning.

[2] So in Rom. xvi. 25, 26, the word is applied to God, and to the times or ages preceding the gospel, which of course ended when the gospel age began. By the above rule of criticism, as *aionios* is applied to the ancient times and the infinite God, if one came to an end, the other must also! See, also, Titus i. 2, in the Greek.

man" in the same sentence, or because he contrasts one with the other, that therefore he believes the wisdom of the man is equal to the wisdom of God. In the one case, "wise" means infinite wisdom, but not in the other; and the difference in the meaning of the adjective is determined by the noun to which it is applied — the infinite being in *God*, not in *wise*. And so with "everlasting," in order to make it mean endless when applied to punishment: it is not enough to show that it is applied to the blessedness of the righteous, unless it can also be shown that *evil* is as necessarily immortal in its nature as *good*, which is the very essence of God.

But the proper answer to this argument is this: "Everlasting or eternal life" is not the exclusive blessing of the future world. It is something, as previously shown, which the believer receives and enjoys in this world; as well as "everlasting punishment" something which the wicked suffer in this world. "Eternal life" is simply the life and blessedness of faith and obedience. Hence the following: "This IS life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John xvii. This blessed knowledge of God and Christ *is* eternal life, whether possessed in this world or in the future. "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, HATH everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but IS PASSED from death unto life." John v. Here as in the passages following, both the death and the life belong to this world, and the believer passes from one to the other while in the flesh. "We know that *we* HAVE PASSED *from death unto life*, because we love

the brethren." 1 John iii. "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye HAVE eternal life." 1 John v.

These passages reveal clearly enough what is the "eternal life" into which the righteous went, as set forth in Matt. xxv. 46; the word *aionios* or *eternal* having more regard to character than duration. It was the rest and peace and joy of faith and obedience; while the "everlasting punishment" was the curse of unbelief, and the judgment of transgression which fell upon the guilty people of that age and generation.

Though it is the object of this chapter to establish general principles of interpretation, rather than to explain particular passages, a few words may be in place respecting the time referred to above, or the time of the judgment set forth in the parable of the sheep and goats. The 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew are a continuous discourse, as the word "*Then*" which opens the 25th shows. *When?* Why, at the time mentioned in the previous chapter, or "immediately after the tribulation of those days" which preceded the overthrow of Jerusalem. Verse 29. The judgment was to take place when the Son of man should come in his glory. And Mark viii. 38 — ix. 1; Luke ix. 26, 27; John xxi. 21–23; and Matt. xvi. 27, 28, are positive proof that this coming to judgment took place in that generation, while those who heard him were living. For example, take the last passage: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he

shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, *There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.*" Now, whatever may have been the character of this coming, two things are settled by this passage.—1 It was a coming to a judgment *according to works*, which is the very judgment of the parable, the whole examination being in regard to works. Chapter xxv. 34—46. 2. This coming and judgment was to take place during the life-time of some of those who heard the Saviour utter these words, confirmed by the fact that John also was to live till the coming took place. See John xxi. 21–23. The time of the judgment is also discovered in the parable itself. There are *three* parties,—not two, as usually supposed,—the righteous, the wicked, and the disciples—"inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of *these my brethren*," who are as separate from those on the right, as they are from those on the left. And this third class is the little band of disciples, kindness to whom in their labors and trials was acknowledged by the Saviour as if done unto himself. The judgment, therefore, plainly belongs to that age, to that people who were in direct intercourse with "these my brethren," or the disciples of Christ, bestowing or refusing the aid and comfort which they so much needed in their missionary life. Those who received and believed in their testimony were rewarded with "life eternal," and those who rejected and persecuted them, and persisted in unbelief and wickedness, were given over to "everlasting punishment."

CHAPTER XII.

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE CONCERNING HELL.

There are three words, or substantive forms, in the Hebrew and Greek, rendered into English by the word Hell. The expression in 2 Pet. ii. 4, "cast them down to hell," is the translation of one Greek word in a participial form. Of these words one, *Sheol*, is pure Hebrew, and, of course, is found only in the Old Testament; one, *Hades*, is pure Greek, and found only in the New Testament; and the third is Hebrew-Greek, and occurs in its Hebrew form *Gee Hinnom* in the Old Testament, and in its Greek dress, *Gehenna*, in the New Testament.

SECTION I.

SHEOL—ITS SCRIPTURAL MEANING AND USAGE—"THE WICKED SHALL BE TURNED INTO HELL."

שְׁאוֹל—*Sheol*, occurs sixty-four times in the Bible, and is translated *Hell* thirty-one times, *Grave* thirty times and *Pit* three times. A careful examination of the passages establishes the fact that it bears one meaning throughout the Old Testament, viz:

The Grave; the Place of the Dead; the Realm

of Death; supposed to be far down below the earth, a kind of *under-world.*[1]

In the following passages, the original of "the grave" is *Sheol.* "I will go down into *the grave* unto my son mourning." Gen. xxxvii. 35. "If mischief befall him (Benjamin,) by the way in which ye go, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs in sorrow to *the grave.*" xlii. 38. "But his hoar head bring thou down to *the grave* with blood." 1 Kings ii. 6, 9. "O, that thou wouldst hide me in *the grave.*" Job. xiv. 13. "For my soul is full of troubles, and my soul draweth nigh to *the grave.*" Ps. lxxxviii. 3. Of Korah and his company, it is said, "They and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit (*Sheol,*) and the earth closed over them, and they perished from among the congregation." Num. xvi. 33.

These passages are sufficient to establish the above definition of *Sheol,* and to illustrate the Scriptural usage in this sense. It is plain that the word signifies the grave; or the underworld of the dead, to which the grave is the gate of entrance. And it is equally plain that all go down to this realm of the dead, *Sheol, grave, hell,* or by whatever name it is

[1] Several passages commonly regarded as figurative, will be found literal, if closely studied. For example: Psalm cxvi. 3. "The pains of hell gat hold on me," is a reference to the grave, or the painful experience of coming to it through death; and is explained by the parallelism, "the sorrows of death compassed me." So Psalm lxxxvi. 13, "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell"—*my life from the grave,* or the realm of death. Isa. lvii. 9, "Thou didst debase thyself even unto hell," is a comparison; as low morally as *Sheol* is naturally, or topographically. Jonah ii. 2, "Out of the belly of hell cried I;" or as we say, "out of the jaws of death."

called; Jacob and Korah, David and Nebuchadnezzar, the faithful servant of God and the guilty transgressor, Israelite and Heathen. It is not a place of punishment nor of reward. It has nothing in its meaning or use touching the misery or the happiness of those who go there. It is simply the realm of death, the place where the dead are, all the dead, whatever their moral character; and it would have been just as correct and exegetical to have translated it "heaven" as "hell." Indeed a learned writer, with great frankness, confesses that *Sheol* "far more often signifieth *the place of the blessed*, whither the saints and patriarchs went when they died, than the place whither sinners went."[1]

And this is the witness of scholars and theologians of all creeds. *Dr. Fairbairn*, the learned professor of Divinity in the College of Glasgow, says: "Beyond doubt, *Sheol*, like *Hades*, was regarded as the abode, after death, alike of the good and the bad." *Dr. Whitby* says: "*Sheol* throughout the Old Testament, signifies not the place of punishment, or of the souls of bad men only, but the grave only, or the place of death." . . . . "It is the place to which the good as well as the bad go." *Dr. Campbell* says, it "signifies the state of the dead, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery." *Dr. Muenscher* says, *Sheol* is "the realm or kingdom of death, an abode deep under the earth. Thither go all men, without distinction. There all pain and anguish cease, and unbroken silence reigns; all is powerless and still." *Le Clerc*, *Grotius*, *Ainsworth*, and others, give the

[1] Poole's Continuators, on the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.

same meaning, "the grave only, or the state of the dead" — *tantum sepulchrum, aut statum mortuorum.*

And the passages where *Sheol* is rendered by the English word *hell*, confirm and illustrate this point. For example: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in *hell;* neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Psalm xvi. 10. Of course "hell" here is the *grave*, which is parallel with "corruption" in the corresponding half verse, according to the structure of Hebrew poetry. The soul of God's Holy One could not certainly have been in a place of endless torment. "For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest *hell*, and shall consume *the earth* with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains." Deut. xxxii. 22–26. "Though they dig into *hell*, thence shall my hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down." Amos ix. 2. "If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in *hell*, behold, thou art there." Ps. cxxxix. 8. "It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than *hell;* what canst thou know." Job xi. 8. In these passages, the heights of heaven, or the firmament, are set in contrast with the depths of Sheol, or the deep underworld of the dead. Men would not be represented as digging into a place of endless torment, or as climbing to a place of heavenly blessedness, to escape the wrath of God; but it is common to speak of the grave as a place of rest and refuge. Hence Job says, "O, that thou wouldst hide me in the grave (*Sheol, hell,*) that thou wouldst keep me secret until thy wrath be past." xiv. 13.

Professor Stuart very properly says, "There can be no reasonable doubt that Sheol does most generally mean the *underworld*, the *grave* or *sepulchre*, the *world of the dead*. It is very clear that there are many passages where no other meaning can reasonably be assigned to it. Accordingly, our English translators have rendered the word *Sheol* grave, in thirty instances out of the whole sixty-four instances in which it occurs."[1]

He thinks, however, that there are five texts, in which Sheol seems to indicate a place of future punishment: Job xxi. 13, Prov. v. 5, ix. 18, xxiii. 14, Psalms ix. 17.[2] It is difficult to see what there is in these five texts, more than in the other fifty-nine, to indicate this doctrine; and this is so evident, that he scarcely names them, before he admits that three of them may "designate a death, violent and premature, inflicted by the hand of heaven." He farther says, that it is "a sound rule in philology, never to depart from the *ordinary* sense of a word, unless the context imperiously demands it." And what is there

[1] To show conspicuously the absurdity of giving to *Sheol* the meaning of *hell* as now understood, it is only necessary to state the fact that it was the name of the first king of Israel, Saul. The words *Sheol* and *Saul* are the same in Hebrew, the difference in the sound arising from a difference in pointing. See *Cruden's Concordance — Definition of Proper Names*. Think of baptizing a child now with the name *Hell!* Does not this simple fact show that the Hebrews could not possibly have associated with *Sheol* the revolting ideas which some Christians attach to our word hell?

[2] He confesses that "the probability that *Sheol* in these texts designates the future punishment of the wicked, depends perhaps in a great measure on the state of knowledge among the Hebrews with regard to future rewards and punishments." This is a curious remark for a critic. In other words: *Sheol* means future punishment, *if* the Hebrews believed in it — and the Hebrews believed in it, *if Sheol* means it!

in the context of these passages which *imperiously demands* a departure from the ordinary sense, which he proves to be "grave" or "place of the dead," by a usage of fifty-nine examples out of sixty-four? Nothing at all — nor does he show that there is.

In Psalm ix. 17, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God," *Sheol* has its ordinary sense, the *grave* or *underworld*. And "the wicked" referred to are "the heathen," or, as David calls them in verse 3, "mine enemies," "the nations that forget God," as the context abundantly proves. It is of the neighboring wicked nations, and not of wicked individuals, that he is speaking. And the meaning is, that they will be destroyed, perhaps by some special judgment, and turned into the grave, or the realm of the dead, *Sheol*. Dr. Alexander, Professor at Princeton, gives the following as the sense: "The wicked shall turn back, even to hell, to *death*, or *to the grave;* all nations forgetful of God. The enemies of God and of his people, shall not only be thwarted and repulsed, but *driven* to destruction, and that not merely individuals, but nations."

Thus our examination shows that *Hell*, in the words of Dr. Whitby, "throughout the Old Testament signifies the grave only, or the place of death." And this fact will be confirmed beyond dispute, when it is remembered that the doctrine of endless punishment, the doctrine even of a future state of retribution, is not taught, nor alluded to, in the Mosaic Law. *Archbishop Whately* says, "As for a future state of retribution in another world, Moses said nothing to the Israelites about that." *Milman*, the author of the "History of the Jews," "History of Christianity," "Latin Christianity," &c., says, Moses "maintains a

profound silence on the rewards and punishments of another life." *Bishop Warburton* testifies that, "In the Jewish Republic, both the rewards and punishments promised by Heaven were temporal only— such as health, long life, peace, plenty and dominion, &c.; Diseases, premature death, war, famine, want, subjections, captivity, &c. And in no one place of the Mosaic Institutes is there the least mention, or any intelligible hint, of the rewards and punishments of another life." *Paley* declares that the Mosaic dispensation "dealt in temporal rewards and punishments. The blessings consisted altogether of worldly benefits, and the curses of worldly punishments." *Prof. Mayer* says, that "the rewards promised the righteous, and the punishments threatened the wicked, are such only as are awarded in the present state of being." *Jahn*, whose work is the text-book of the Andover Theological Seminary, says, "We have no authority, therefore, decidedly to say, that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue good and avoid evil, than those which were derived from the rewards and punishments of this life." To the same important fact testify *Prof. Wines*, *Bush*, *Arnauld*, and other distinguished Theologians and scholars.[1] Of course, then, if the doctrine of

[1] *Encyc. Britan.*, vol. i. Dis. 3. WHATELEY'S "Peculiarities of the Christian Religion," p. 44, 2d edition, and his "Scripture Revelations of a Future State," pp. 18, 19, American edition. MILMAN'S "Hist. of Jews," vol. i. 117. "Divine Legation," vol. iii. pp. 1, 2, &c. 10th London edition. PALEY'S works, vol. v. p. 110, Sermon xiii. JAHN'S "Archæology," § 314. LEE, in his "Eschatology," says: "It should be remembered that the rewards and punishments of the Mosaic Institutes were exclusively temporal. Not an allusion is found, in the case of either individuals or communities, in which reference is made to the good or evil of a future state as motive to obedience." p. 144. The reader will note that all these are *orthodox* authorities.

future endless punishment is not revealed in the Mosaic Dispensation, *Sheol* cannot mean any such thing. If, therefore, such a place of torment exists, as some Christians believe in, it has no name in the Old Testament! Leigh, in his "Critica Sacra," says, frankly, "All learned Hebrew scholars know that the Hebrews have no word proper for hell, as we take hell."[1] But surely, if God had revealed such a place to Moses or the prophets, he would have revealed it with a name.

Let the reader then seriously, and with a prayer for divine direction, consider these important facts — facts forced upon the biblical scholars and theologians named; and, though directly in conflict with their creeds, ingenuously and honestly confessed. *There is no word for hell, as believed by certain Christian sects, in all the Old Testament.* The doctrine of a future state of endless torment for the wicked, is not in the Hebrew Scriptures, which cover two thirds of the whole period of Man's life and history on this earth!

And it is at this point that the argument presses with tremendous weight. If the doctrine of endless punishment be true, then for four thousand years God made no revelation of it! From Moses to Malachi the Scriptures are entirely silent on the subject. What shall we say of that justice which could see the millions of earth through all this time, in utter ignorance of their fate, plunging into the gulf of endless torment and despair — without one word of

[1] EDWARD LEIGH was, according to HORNE, "one of the most learned men of his time, and his work is a valuable help to the understanding of the original languages of the Scriptures."—*Intro.* vol ii. 705.

warning? Think of this for a moment — that God should suffer the world to go on for forty centuries, with not the slightest hint of danger to those who were daily and hourly sinking into the flaming abyss! Is it possible to believe such monstrous blasphemy against that God who is Love?

HANS ANDERSEN, the poet of Denmark, and one of the most instructive and pleasing authors of the day, says: "I received gladly, both with feeling and understanding, the doctrine that *God is Love;* everything which opposes this—a burning hell, therefore, whose fire endured forever — I could not recognise."— "*Story of my Life,*" p. 77. The same aversion to the revolting dogma, and the same recognition of the final triumph of good and God, glow through the pages of half the popular writers of the day, as HOLMES, WINTHROP, FROUDE, KINGSLEY, Dr. GEORGE MOORE (author of "Body and Mind," "Soul and Body," &c., in *Harper's Miscellany,*) Mrs. SHERWOOD, the BRONTES, WILLIAM and MARY HOWITT—and especially of the poets, as LEIGH HUNT, BAILEY, in "Festus," (the very plot of which is universal redemption,) THOMPSON, ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING, TENNYSON, WORDSWORTH, WHITTIER, CHARLES LAMB, SOUTHEY, &c. As an example, take the following from the last named:

"What though at birth we bring with us the seed
Of sin and mortal taint—yet are we still
The children of the All-Merciful; and ill
They teach, who tell us that from hence must flow
God's wrath; and then, His justice to fulfil,
Death everlasting, never-ending wo!
O miserable lot of man, if it were so!
Falsely and impiously they teach who thus
Our heavenly Father's will misread!
In bounty hath the Lord created us,
In love redeemed. From this authentic creed
Let no bewildering sophistry impede
The heart's entire assent; for God is good.
Hold firm this faith, and in whatever need,
Doubt not but thou wilt find thy soul endued
With all-sufficient strength and fortitude."

SECTION II.

HADES — ITS SCRIPTURAL IMPORT AND USAGE. "THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS."

Αδης — *Hades* is found eleven times only in the New Testament, and is rendered by the word *Hell* ten times, and once by the word *Grave*. 1 Cor. xv. 55. It is universally allowed by critics that *Hades* corresponds in meaning with *Sheol;* and this is confirmed by the fact that the *Septuagint*,[1] which is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, made in part about three hundred years before Christ, has rendered *Sheol* by the word *Hades* sixty times out of sixty-four instances where it occurs. However, with regard to the meaning of the word, in the New Testament, it may be well to have independent testimony.

§ I. *Meaning and usage of Hades.* A theologian, equally learned as a scholar, judicious as a critic, and impartial as a commentator, says of *Hades*, —

"In my judgment, *it ought never in Scripture to be rendered Hell*, at least in the sense wherein that word is universally understood by Christians. It is very plain that neither in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, nor in the New, does the word *Hades* convey the meaning which the present English word *Hell*, in the Christian usage, always conveys to our minds. The attempt to illustrate this would be unnecessary, as it is hardly now pretended by any

[1] The *Septuagint*, or Seventy, sometimes written the LXX., is so called from the fact or tradition of its being the joint labor of seventy learned Jews in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. It was in use in our Saviour's time.

critic that this is the acceptation of the term in the Old Testament." [1]

And now let us turn to the New Testament, and we shall find that *Hades*, in its literal usage, is the equivalent of *Sheol*, signifying,

§ I. *The grave, the underworld, or place of the dead.*

The first passage to be noted is 1 Cor. xv. 55. "O death where is thy sting? O grave (*hades*) where is thy victory." Here *hades* is properly translated, the resurrection being very appropriately celebrated as a victory over the grave. And the true

[1] Dr. CAMPBELL, "Preliminary Dissertations," Diss. vi. part ii. LE CLERC affirms that "neither *Hades* nor *Sheol* ever signify in the Sacred Scripture the abode of evil spirits, but only the sepulchre, or the state of the dead." And this is also the testimony of GROTIUS and other learned men.—*De Eligenda, inter Dissentientes Christianos, Sententia Liber.* § vii. See also POOLE'S "Continuators on Luke," xvi. 19–30. These testimonies, which might be added to indefinitely, are enough to show that *Hades* in the New Testament is simply the Greek form of what *Sheol* is in the old; and therefore that "Hell" does not convey to the people of this day the same idea which *Hades* conveyed to the people in the time of Christ. It is plain, too, that at the time our translation was made, "Hell" in English did not bear the exclusive meaning it has now. The Apostle's Creed, so called, is proof of this, when it says, that Christ after his crucifixion "descended into hell!" Surely the Protestant English Church did not mean to say that Christ went into a place of endless woe. Therefore, as Prof. STUART says, "Hell, in this document, means the *underworld*, the world of the dead, and so it has been construed by the most intelligent critics of the English Church." It has been very correctly said that "Hell, in its primitive signification, corresponded perfectly in meaning with *Hades*. It comes from the Anglo-Saxon, *helan*, to cover or hide; hence the *tiling* or *slating* of a house is called, in Cornwall, *helling* to this day; and the covers of books in Lancashire by the same name—so the literal import of the original word *Hades* was formerly well expressed by it." CAMPBELL, DODDRIDGE, CLARKE, PARKHURST and others. I saw lately in an English newspaper, an account of an accident which happened to a Slater, who "fell from the roof while engaged in *helling* it."

meaning of *hades* is seen by the law of parallelism, before noticed, which often runs into the New Testament; for though the language is Greek, the structure and idiomatic forms are largely Hebrew. Thus:

> "O Death where is thy sting?
> O Grave where is thy victory."

The thought is simply repeated; "grave," or *hades*, answering to "death," the "victory" being taken from one, and the "sting" from the other. And the thought is substantially that of Hosea xiii. 14:

> "O Death I will be thy plagues;
> O Grave (*Sheol*) I will be thy destruction."

The same connection or association of Death and Hades appears in every passage in the book of Revelations in which the word occurs, as follows — i. 18, vi. 8, xx. 13, 14:

"I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore, amen; and have the keys of hell (*hades*) and of death."

"And I looked, and behold, a pale horse; and his name that sat on him was Death, and hell (*hades*) followed with him."

"And the sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and hell (*hades*) delivered up the dead which were in them."

"And death and hell (*hades*) were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death."

With regard to these passages, it is plain enough that the Revelator employed the word *hades* to signify *the region of the dead*, or *the kingdom of death*. Death and Hades are both personified, or represented

as persons; and in chapter vi. 8, Death is a king or leader, followed by his hosts, the inhabitants of *Hades*, or the Dead. And an eminent critic says that the "*Hades* of the Apocalypse, is the genuine *Sheol* of the Hebrews; with the exception, perhaps, that the Hebrew sacred books have nowhere represented hades as having a king over it." This poetical representation, however, is in perfect keeping with the strongly metaphorical style of the book.

Acts ii. 27, 31. "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (*hades*,) neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Of this quotation from David, Psalm xvi. 10, Peter says, "He seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell (*hades*,) neither his flesh did see corruption." Of course, the meaning of *hades* or *hell*, in these texts, is *grave*, or realm of death, as in the preceding passages. It is the same, also, in the following: "Thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell (*hades*,) shall not prevail against it." Matt. xvi. 18. Le Clerc translates "the gates of hell" *portæ sepulchri*, or "the gates of the sepulchre," or the grave; and says the meaning of the passage is, that the church shall never die, or become extinct. Stuart, and others, take a similar view.[1]

§ II. *Hades* is used also as a figure to represent

[1] The same figure is found in Isa. xxxviii. 10. "I said in the cutting off of my days, I shall go the *gates of the grave*" (*Sheol*); Psalm ix. 13, "Thou liftest me up from *the gates of death*"; cvii. 18, "They draw near to *the gates of death*." *Sheol* or *Hades* is represented as the *Underworld*, the entrance to which is shut up by gates; and in Rev. i. 18, Christ is said to have the "keys of hell" (*hades*), the gates of which he opened by his Resurrection

a condition of extreme suffering, or utter destruction.

"And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell," (*hades.*) Matt. xi. 23, Luke xi. 15. The meaning of this is too obvious to require explanation.

The only remaining passage is Luke xvi. 19–21. "And in hell (*hades*) he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." In order to understand this, we must note the following particulars:

1. It is not a history; but a parable. Not a literal relation of facts respecting individuals, but a figurative representation of events touching the Jews (the Rich Man,) on one hand, and the Gentiles (Lazarus,) on the other; as in the parables of the unfaithful Husbandmen, the Marriage Feast, the Master of the House, &c. Dr. Bloomfield, in his Greek Testament, says, "The best commentators, both ancient and modern, with reason consider it as *a parable;* since all the circumstances seem parabolical, and a story very similar to it, is found in the Babylonian Gemara." So Whitby.

2. If a parable, it must be interpreted as a parable. We must not expect to find a meaning for every particular, but look only to the main scope and design of the parable. The "five brethren," the "drop of water," "cooling the tongue," &c., have no more *special* meaning, than "the fatted calf," "the ring," "the shoes," in the parable of the Prodigal Son. "Comparison is not to be extended," says Professor Stuart, "to all the circumstances of the allegory. Thus, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, the point to be illustrated, is *the extent of the duty of be-*

neficence. Most of the circumstances go to make up merely the veri-similitude of the narration, so that it may give pleasure to him who hears or reads it."

3. "The point to be illustrated" in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, is *the rejection and punishment of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles into the privileges and blessings of the Gospel.* This is the main scope and design of the parable, and the leading particulars have significance as follows:

(*a*) *The Rich Man*, clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day, represents the Jews, their wealth of spiritual privileges and blessings, "because that unto them were committed the oracles of God" (Heb. iii. 1–3,), and they were favored with the ministry of prophets and holy men.

(*b*) *Lazarus*, the beggar, feeding on crumbs, and full of sores, represents the Gentiles, their spiritual poverty and ignorance.

(*c*) *Their Death* represents respectively the change in their conditions, which took place on the setting up of the Gospel kingdom in the earth. The *Rich Man* dead, is the Jewish nation dead to, or deprived of, all its former privileges and gifts of divine knowledge. *Lazarus* dead, is the Gentiles dead to their former condition of spiritual poverty and unbelief. Death in both cases is the opposite of the former life; as death is always the opposite of life.

(*d*) *Lazarus in Abraham's bosom*, represents the Gentiles translated into the new life of Gospel faith, and knowledge, and salvation.

(*e*) *The Rich Man in torment* represents the Jews suffering the punishment of their sins, in the destruction of their city and temple, and the sore calamities which have fallen on them ever since.

(*f*) The *great gulf* represents the antagonism of unbelief between Jews and Christians (Gentiles,) and the utter want of religious sympathy and fellowship which separates the two people.

(*g*) The request of the Rich Man respecting his five brethren, and the reply of Abraham, are only put in to show the obstinacy of the Jews in their refusal to believe in Christ as the Messiah; since, if their own scriptures (Moses and the Prophets,) could not convince them, neither would they be persuaded "if one went unto them from the dead." And this was literally and singularly verified; for when a real Lazarus was raised from the dead by Jesus, the chief priests and pharisees not only refused to believe, but were so enraged that they sought to kill both Jesus and Lazarus. John xi. xii.

The same thing expressed in the metaphors of this parable, is stated in direct terms in other passages: "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Matt. xxi. 43. "It was necessary the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles, for so hath the Lord commanded us, saying," &c. Acts xiii. 46. "There shall be weeping, and gnashing of teeth, when ye see many coming from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, and sitting with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of God, while you yourselves are cast out;" or, as Matthew has it, "the children of the kingdom shall be cast out." Luke xiii. 28, 29; Matt. viii. 11, 12. Of course, "the kingdom of God"

cannot refer to the immortal state, for those in *that* heaven, the children of *that* kingdom, are not to be cast out. The kingdom here is the Gospel kingdom on earth, "the children of the kingdom" the Jews, so-called because of the special favors and privileges bestowed on them — and they are cast out, and the Gentiles received in their place; just as the Rich Man and Lazarus change conditions, the one deprived of his "good things," and "tormented," and the other delivered from his "evil things," and "comforted." [1]

Thus we see that while "Abraham's bosom," which is a Jewish idiom or phrase for the blessed life of paradise, represents the exaltation of the Gentile world to the privileges of God's chosen people;

[1] Some of the most eminent modern orthodox commentators allow of this application. Dr. GILL, the learned Baptist critic, makes a two-fold application, and says of the latter, "it may also be understood of the political and ecclesiastical death of the Jewish people, which lay in the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and in the abolition of the temple worship and the whole ceremonial law, and a death of afflictions by captivity and calamities of every kind, attending them ever since." *In hell in torments.* "This," he says, "may regard the vengeance of God on the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem," &c. LIGHTFOOT, of the Westminster Assembly, says, "the main scope and design of the parable seems this,—to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews; who though they had Moses and the prophets, did not believe them." BATE, of the English Church, takes the same view, making the death of Lazarus the introduction of the Gentiles into the Church of God, and the death of the rich man the rejection of the Jews. See the citations at large in PAIGE'S "Selections from Eminent Commentators." This view of the parable is to be found also among the Fathers. AUGUSTINE (A. D. 400,) says, "In Divite intelligantur superbi Judæorum, ignorantes Dei justitiam, &c. — *Quæst. Evang.*, lib. iii. q. 38. GREGORY the Great, A. D. 550, says, "Dives iste Judaicum populum designat, &c. *Hom.* 40 in *Evang.* and in *Moral*, lib. XXV. c. 13. THEOPHYLACT, A. D., 1050, elaborates this as a probable interpretation.— *Trench on the Parables.*

Hades, or the state of death, represents the national *death* of the Jews, or their utter desolation and ruin as a people.

But we discover from this parable, that in the time of Christ, the Jews had partially adopted the pagan ideas respecting *Hades*, or the *Underworld*, viz: that it contains separate apartments for the good and bad; and that in Tartarus, the portion assigned to the wicked, there were torments, flames, &c., in punishment of their sins.

This, and 2 Pet. ii. 4, are the only passages in the Bible which allude to this fact. Josephus, however, confirms it. He speaks of suicides being "received into the darkest part of *Hades;*" and says the Pharisees held that *under the earth* (Hades,) there are rewards and punishments accordingly as they have been virtuous or vicious in this life. [1]

The Jews had no such notions at the close of the Old Testament, as we have seen; and during the four hundred years which intervened between Malachi and Christ, there was no prophet, no revelation whatever. They could not, therefore, have obtained them from any divine source. Whence, then, did they obtain them? There is only one answer possible — they borrowed them from the heathen, with whom they were current; they adopted them from the Greek and Roman mythology, from which they had taken many other doctrines and opinions not found in the Law or the Prophets. Hence the words of the Saviour, "In vain they do worship me, *teach-*

[1] *Jewish War*, Book iii. chapter 8, sec. 5 See also the *Jewish Antiquities*, Book xviii. chapter i. sec. 2-6.

ing for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. xv. 6–9.[1]

Now, can any Christian believe that our Saviour adopted these superstitions which the Jews had borrowed from the heathen? It will not do to say that he revealed the doctrine of torments in a hell after death, because both Jews and Heathen believed it before he came. If, therefore, he teaches the doctrine in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, he teaches a heathen doctrine; for it is certain he did not take it from the Old Testament, because it is not there; and he was not sent to reveal it, because if it be true, it was already revealed to the heathen, or they had found it out, without a revelation, ages before his coming!

It is plain, therefore, that the Saviour simply employs this heathenish notion of the Jews, in parable, as an illustration, just as he speaks of Beelzebub, the Philistine god of flies (Matt. x. 25, xii. 24,) or Mammon, the god of riches (Matt. vi. 24;) without recognizing the existence of either, or sanctioning belief in such falsehoods and absurdities.

We do the same thing now, when we speak of "St. Vitus's Dance," "Kings Evil," "St. Anthony's fire," without the least faith in the superstition which gives these names to the particular diseases they designate.

[1] The truth is, that in the four hundred years of their intercourse with the heathen, during which they were without any divine teacher or message, Pagan philosophy and superstition had, so far as regarded the future state, completely pushed aside the Law of Moses and the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and set up in place of them the most extravagant inventions and fables respecting the invisible world. See this abundantly proved in the author's "Origin and History of the Doctrine of End'ess Punishment." cap. iv.

And Universalists and others use the popular terms "Orthodox," and "Evangelical," merely for the sake of convenience, without admitting that those designated *are* Orthodox or Evangelical.

To argue that Christ taught or sanctioned the doctrine of this Jewish parable respecting the future state, instead of simply using it for illustration, is to argue that he believed it as there set forth. But does any one suppose that Christ believed that heaven and hell are separated by a great gulf, across which the inhabitants can see each other, and talk together? that the damned are tormented in literal fire and flame? that they have tongues whose pain could be eased by a drop, or an ocean, of water? that they petition Abraham, or any one, to send messengers from heaven to their friends on earth, to warn them against the torments of hell? Of course, he believed nothing of the kind; nor is he at all responsible for the truth of such pagan dogmas, because he alludes to them in this parable, for the purpose of enforcing a warning or lesson. [1]

Thus closes the examination of the Scriptural usage of *Hades*, which, as we have seen, is in its lit-

[1] Dr. BLOOMFIELD, of the English Church, says, "*No responsibility on our Lord's part is involved in this case*; for our best Commentators and Theologians are agreed that in parabolic narrations, provided the doctrines inculcated be strictly true, the terms in which they are expressed, may be adapted to the prevailing notions of those to whom they are addressed." — *Greek Test., in loco.* Dr. MACKNIGHT, Scotch Presbyterian, confesses "that our Lord's descriptions (in this parable) are not drawn from the writings of the Old Testament, but have a remarkable affinity to the descriptions which the Grecian poets have given. If from these resemblances it is thought the parable is formed on the Grecian mythology, it will not at all follow that our Lord approved of what the common people thought or spake concerning those matters, agreeably to the notions of the Greeks."

eral sense the equivalent of *Sheol* in every text, save the last, in which appear the heathen notions respecting its being a place of rewards and punishments, or the region in which are located both hell and heaven. The following facts are worthy of note:

1. If *Hades* is "hell" in the ordinary definition of the word, then the soul of Christ was in hell after his crucifixion. "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell. He spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell." Acts ii. 27, 31.

2. It is equally true of all in hell, that they will not be left there; for the Revelator says, "Death and Hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to his works." xx. 13. If it be said that, after they are judged, they will be sent back again, we demand the proof. But even it be so, we still have to note—

3. That hell is to be utterly destroyed. To say nothing of 1 Cor. xv. 55, "O death where is thy sting? O hell (*hades*) where is thy victory?" we have the direct testimony — "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." Rev. xx. 14. And these two passages are the exact equivalent of Hosea xiv. 14. "I will ransom them from the power of hell (*Sheol — Hades,*) I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O hell (*Sheol — Hades,*) I will be thy destruction." Dr. Campbell says, on Rev. xx. 14, "if we interpret *Hades*, 'hell,' in the Christian sense of the word, the whole passage is rendered nonsense. *Hell* is represented as being cast into *hell;* for so the lake of fire, which is in this place denominated the second death, is universally interpreted." The

phrase "cast into the lake of fire" is a figure of utter destruction. It is simply saying "death and hell were destroyed."

4. Of course, then, *Hades*, "hell," is not a place of endless torment, otherwise it could not be destroyed. Whatever, therefore, the interpretation given to the narration of Dives and Lazarus, whether regarded as a parable, or literal history, it is plain that the Rich Man was not in a place of *endless* torment. Or, in the more general phrase of Prof. Stuart: "Whatever the state of either the righteous or the wicked may be, whilst in *Hades*, that state will certainly cease, and be exchanged for another at the general resurrection." [1]

[1] Those who would see an argument for *Hades* as an *intermediate state*, a view which seems to be growing among the sects, may read an article in the Baptist "Christian Review" for April, 1862, on "*The Righteous Dead, between Death and the Resurrection;*" and on the other side, see "*Bibliotheca Sacra*" for January, 1862, "*The Spirits in Prison.*" The last writer thinks the idea of future opportunities for repentance and salvation is "gaining new adherents at the present time;" and refers to Rev. B. H. WILSON'S essay on the "National Church," in the "Recent Inquiries in Theology by eminent English Churchmen." In this essay, the author, alluding to the *Limbus Infantum* of the Catholic Church, says there may be mansions hereafter for those who are "infants in spiritual development—nurseries, or seed grounds, where the undeveloped may grow up under new conditions, the stunted become strong, and the perverted restored;" and that finally when "Christ shall have surrendered his kingdom to the Great Father, *all, both small and great, shall find a refuge in the bosom of the universal parent*, to repose, or be quickened into higher life, in the ages to come, according to his will." p. 232, American edition. Dr. WATTS, even, thought that "the perfections of God will contrive a way of escape for the repentant sinner hereafter," though he has not revealed this.— *World to Come*, Works, i. 738.

SECTION III.

JEHENNA — ITS SCRIPTURAL MEANING AND USAGE — "DESTRUCTION OF SOUL AND BODY IN HELL" — WAS IT USED IN THE TIME OF CHRIST AS A SYMBOL OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT?

γεεννα — *Gehenna*, occurs twelve times in the New Testament, and is in every case translated *Hell*. Five of the twelve examples are parallel passages, which reduces the actual usage to seven.

I. *Origin and meaning of the word.* It is universally agreed that *Gehenna* is the Greek form of *Gee Hinnom* a compound Hebrew word, signifying *the valley of Hinnom*. The history of this place is given as follows, by the learned Calmet, a Catholic critic and theologian:

"Gehenna properly signifies the valley of Hinnom, a valley just south of Jerusalem. The valley is called Tophet, (Jeremiah vii. 31,) from the drums which were beaten to drown the cries of the victims. After the captivity, the Jews regarded this spot with abhorrence, on account of the abominations which had been practised there, and following the example of Josiah, they threw into it every species of filth, as well as the carcasses of animals, and the dead bodies of malefactors. To prevent the pestilence which such a mass would occasion, if left to putrefy, constant fires were maintained in the valley in order to consume the whole, and hence the place received the appellation of *Gehenna fire*."

With this agrees the statement of Prof. Stuart of Andover: "It would seem that the custom of dese-

crating this place, thus happily begun, was continued in after ages, down to the period when our Saviour was on the earth. Perpetual fires were kept up in order to consume the offal which was deposited there. And as the same offal would breed worms, (for so all putrifying meat does, of course,) hence came the expression, 'where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.'"

Schleusner, the learned German Lexicographer, after stating the same facts, says, "Hence it came, that *any severe punishment*, especially an infamous kind of death, *was described by the word Gehenna*, or hell."[1]

II. *Old Testament usage.* In the Old Testament Scriptures, the word seems to be employed in its literal sense only, as the name of a place, a valley on the south of Jerusalem, which, as above stated, after the time of Josiah, was held in special abomination, because of the idolatrous worship set up there. The following are all the passages in the Old Testament in which it occurs.

Josh. xv. 8. "And the border went up by *the valley of the Son of Hinnom*, unto the south side of the Jebusite," &c. 2 Kings xxiii. 10. "And he (Josiah) defiled Topheth, which is in *the valley of the children of Hinnom*, that no man might make his son or daughter pass through the fire to Molech."

[1] Lexicon on *Gehenna*.. He says, also, that it is used as a symbol of the future torments of the wicked in the New Testament, but this is assuming the point to be proved. It is not enough to quote a passage, and say it means this. We ask, why? where is the evidence? The testimony given in the text is repeated by WHITBY, CLARKE, BUSH, ROSENMULLER, MACKNIGHT, PARKHURST, and Biblical scholars of every denomination.

2 Chron. xxviii. 3. "Moreover he (Ahaz) burnt incense in *the valley of the son of Hinnom*, and burnt his children in the fire, after the abominations of the heathen." Jer. vii. 31, 32; xix. 2–6, are repetitions of this fact, with the prophet's terrible denunciations of judgment upon the guilty people of Judah, for these idolatrous cruelties, for their wicked apostacy from the law and worship of Jehovah.

It can hardly be said to be used in any of these texts as a figure, or as a symbol of judgment. It is employed rather in the way of contrast or comparison, thus: "I will make this city as Tophet (or *Gehenna*, Tophet being the place of sacrifice in *Gee Hinnom*;) and the houses of Jerusalem, and the kings of Judah, shall be defiled as the place of Tophet," &c., and "it shall be called the valley of slaughter." Jer. xix. Here the sense is evidently literal, and the prophet says that Jerusalem shall become as defiled and desolate as Gee Hinnom or Tophet — as we say, by way of comparison, "barren as a desert," "loathsome as a slaughter house."

Isaiah has the following: "They shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." lxvi. 23–24. The entire context shows that this language, which is descriptive of some of the disgusting accompaniments of the valley of Hinnom, is used in its literal sense. Verses 14 and 15, represent the Lord as coming "like a whirlwind to render his anger with fury, . . . for by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh; and the slain of the Lord shall be many."

And then to show how great the number, he represents "the carcasses of the men who have transgressed" as lying in such heaps in *Geehinnom*, or "the valley of slaughter," that the fires would not be quenched, or would be continually burning to consume them, and the worms continually breeding from the putrefaction. There is nothing figurative in this, but a prophetic statement of simple facts; and the "new moons" and "sabbaths," the "going forth" and "looking on the carcasses," &c., confirm the literal sense of the language used.[1]

III. *The New Testament usage.* We come now to examine the usage of *Gehenna*, in the New Testament, where we shall find that, though it has not wholly lost its literal signification, it has taken on another, viz: a figurative or symbolic meaning. And the first point we have to consider here, is the assertion so confidently and universally made by those believing in the doctrine, that "it was used by the Jews in the time of the Saviour, to describe the future torment of the wicked; and that, therefore, he must have used it in the same sense, if he expected the people to understand him." Let us then proceed to the review of this point; and in order to have it before us in a definite shape for discussion, we will put it in the form of a question —

Was Gehenna used in the time of Christ as the symbol of future punishment?

[1] A careful examination of the passages will show, I think, that *Gee Hinnom* is not used in the Old Testament, as commonly stated, as a symbol or emblem of judgment; but simply in its literal sense, as the name of the valley South of Jerusalem. The most that can be said of it is, that it is employed in comparison—Jerusalem shall be *as* Geehinnom or Tophet.

It is admitted that in the four hundred years between the Old Testament and the New, the word *Gehenna* had come to be used as a symbol, or figure, of judgment or punishment; but what kind of judgment? what kind of punishment? In order to answer this, we must refer to the literature of that age; to such records or writings as have come down to us from the time of Christ, or such times, antecedent and subsequent, as may serve to determine the meaning and usage of the word. The following are all the competent witnesses in the case:

(*a*) B. C. 280–150. *The Septuagint*, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, made between the dates here given, uses the word only in its literal sense, as the name of a valley south of Jerusalem. This is proof, that up to within 150 years before Christ, it had not lost its literal, etymological meaning.

(*b*) B. C. 150–50. *The Apocrypha*, are the only Jewish writings of this period extant, and therefore the only authority in the case. The Wisdom of Solomon, and the Second Book of Maccabees, the only books containing any allusion to future punishment, come within these dates. *Gehenna* is not found in either of them. Though they constantly speak of the torments of the wicked after death, they never use this word to designate the place of them, or to describe the character of them. It is scarcely possible they could have avoided using it, if it had acquired this meaning at this date, i. e. within fifty years of Christ.

(*c*) B. C. 30 — A. D. 40. *Philo Judæus*. The dates show Philo to have lived and written in the

very times of the Saviour. He was an Egyptian Jew, of the sect of the Pharisees, and a believer in punishment after death. He frequently introduces the subject, and describes the place of torment as "a dark region, covered with profound night, and perpetual blackness;" but he never calls it *Gehenna*. The word is nowhere found in his works. Of course, as Philo's works cover the very ground in dispute, there is not a line of evidence to prove that *Gehenna* was used by the Jews of our Saviour's time, to signify a place of endless torment for the wicked. And this will be confirmed by the next witness.

(*d*) A. D. 70–100. *Josephus* wrote immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem. He was a Pharisee, and a believer in future punishment. He gives an account of the opinions of the various Jewish sects, and often states his own belief on this point at great length; but he never uses the word *Gehenna* to represent this belief, or in any way to describe the miseries of the damned. And, speaking on this subject as often as he does, it seems utterly impossible, if *Gehenna* had taken on this meaning in his time, that he should not have employed it in this sense. Those who believe in endless torment, at this day, constantly use the word "hell" to express this idea; and if "Gehenna" had the same meaning among the Jews in the time of our Saviour, we should certainly find it so used in those passages of Philo and Josephus, where they discuss this subject. But instead of this, as observed, it is not found in a single instance in all their voluminous writings!

(*e*) A. D. 100–200. From the time of Josephus onward, there is an interval of about one hundred

years, in which we have no Jewish writings whatever. This was the period which followed the destruction of their city and nation, when they were scattered over the earth as chaff before the wind.

(*f*) A. D. 200. *The Targum* of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, which has been cited as proof of the usage of *Gehenna*, in the time of Christ, was not written till two hundred years after Christ; and is, therefore, no proof at all. In this Targum we find the word used to describe the torments of the wicked after death; but its late date takes it out of the discussion. [1]

There is, therefore, no proof whatever from contemporary usage, to show the meaning of *Gehenna* in the New Testament. Its usage, therefore, must determine its meaning. And, on examination, we find that it is probably used in its *literal sense* in the first passage where it occurs:

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and

[1] Dr. JAHN assigns it to the end of the 3d century after Christ; EICHHORN decides for the 4th century; BERTHOLDT inclines to the 2d or 3d century, and is confident that it "cannot have attained its present complete form, before the end of the second century." BAUER coincides generally in these views. Some critics put the date even as low down as the 7th or 8th century. See a full discussion of the question in the Universalist Expositor, ii. 351–368. See, also, HORNE's Introduction, ii. 157–163. JUSTIN MARTYR, A. D. 150, and CLEMENT of Alexandria, A. D., 195, both employ *Gehenna* to designate the place of future punishment; but the first utters an opinion only of its meaning in a certain text, and the last was a Universalist, and did not, of course, believe that *Gehenna* was the place of endless punishment. AUGUSTINE, A. D., 400, says *Gehenna*, "*stagnum ignis et sulphuris corporeus ignis erit.*"—*De Civitate Dei*, L. xxi. c. 10.

whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire," or the fire of Gehenna. Matt. v. 22.

It is plain that reference is had here to the punishment of burning alive in the valley of Hinnom. "There are three offences here which exceed each other in their degrees of guilt. 1. *Anger* against a man, accompanied with some injurious act. 2. *Contempt*, expressed by the opprobrious epithet *raca*, or shallow brains. 3. *Hatred* and *mortal enmity*, expressed by the term *moreh*, or apostate, where such apostacy could not be proved.

Now proportioned to these three offences, were three different degrees of punishment, each exceeding the other in its severity, as the offences exceed each other in their different degrees of guilt. 1. The *judgment*, the council of twenty-three, which could inflict the punishment of strangling. 2. The *Sanhedrim*, or great council, which could inflict the punishment of stoning. And 3. The being burnt alive in the valley of the son of Hinnom. This appears to be the meaning of our Lord." [1]

It is impossible to believe the Saviour meant to say that the difference between calling a man a blockhead, and calling him an apostate (the meaning of "thou fool,") was so great, that while the offender in one case would only be stoned, in the other he would be given over to eternal tortures! There is no proportion here; but there *is* some just relation between being stoned and being burned alive, in comparison

[1] A. Clarke on the passage. Kuinoel, Rosenmuller, Townsend, and others, take this view; as may be seen in Paige's Selections.

with the respective offences. The simple meaning of the passage is, that under the Christian law, causeless anger, and malignant speech against a brother, would be regarded as criminal, and as deserving of punishment, as the greatest crimes "by them of old time." And the thought is illustrated by reference to offences and punishments with which the people were familiar.

But chiefly *Gehenna* is used in the New Testament, *as an emblem of anything foul and disgusting, and especially as the symbol of terrible and destructive judgments.*

James iii. 6, is an example of the first meaning. Speaking of the tongue, he says, "It defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and is set on fire of hell," *Gehenna.* The meaning is obvious, though the translation may be awkward. An impure and licentious tongue, or conversation, inflames the passions and lusts, and "defileth the whole body." And to describe the filthiness of such a tongue, he refers, in figure, to that loathsome place, Gehenna, with all its rottenness, its foul fires, putrefaction, worms and stench. And nothing could be more graphic or forcible to a Jew.

In Matt. xiii. 15, the Saviour says to the Pharisees, "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves." It is quite probable that he uses Gehenna here in the same sense in which James employs it; in the same sense in which he uses "whited sepulchres" in verse 27, to represent their corrupt and criminal character, their moral uncleanness and vileness.

But in verse 33, it is evidently employed as a symbol of judgment. "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Here, unquestionably, "damnation of hell," or *Gehenna*, points out the terrible calamities and utter ruin coming upon the guilty nation, as the punishment of their unbelief and sin; and of which he says farther on, verse 36, "Verily I say unto you, *all these things shall come upon this generation.*."

Matt. x. 28. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," — *Gehenna.*

Luke xii. 5. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear. Fear him which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell," — *Gehenna.* Several things are to be noted here:

1. The same terms are applied to both body and soul: "kill the body" and "kill the soul"; "destroy both soul and body in hell." Now, if killing the body is destroying the life of it, killing the soul is the same thing; and this is plain from the fact that the soul is destroyed in the same sense as the body. And the body, *the same body that men can kill*, is to be destroyed in the same way, *and in the same hell*, as the soul. Of course, therefore, the hell must be of such sort, and, *if a place*, so located as to reach the earthly body. It cannot, therefore, be a hell such as is believed in now, because no one supposes that this body of flesh, which men can kill, is to be tortured with the soul.

2. The text does not say that God *will* destroy soul and body, but only that he is *able* to do it; nor does the parallel text say that, after he hath killed, he *will* cast into hell, or utterly destroy, but only that *he hath power* to do it. In Matt. iii. 9, Christ says that "God *is able* of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham"; but he does not mean to say he will do it. And in Matt. xxvi. 53, he says he *could* pray for and receive to his help twelve legions of angels, but he did not do it.

3. If the text asserts that God *will* destroy both soul and body, and not simply that he is able to; or, in other words, if it teaches what is certain, and not what is possible, then it proves, not the endless torment of the wicked, but utter extinction of being, the annihilation of soul and body together.

4. The phrase seems to have been a kind of proverb, expressive of complete destruction. Isaiah employs it in this sense: "The Lord shall kindle a burning like the burning of fire, ... and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briers in one day; and shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, *both soul and body.*" x. 16–18. This refers to national overthrow, "a proverbial expression," says Dr. Clarke, signifying "that they should be entirely and altogether consumed."[1]

What Christ intends to say in this passage is simply this: If you are tempted to deny me and the truth through fear of persecution and death, (as Peter was afterward,) remember that God can bring greater judgments upon you for your abandonment of the

[1] QUERY. What are the soul and body of forests and fruitful fields? How impossible to interpret such phraseology literally.

gospel, than men can for your defence of it. Men can kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but God can kill the soul, can destroy soul and body together. You should fear him, therefore, rather than men; and to enforce the lesson he pictures this judgment under the well-known figure of *Gehenna*, or of *being cast into Gehenna*.

But to show that he was speaking only of what was possible, and that, faithful to the truth, they had nothing to fear; he says, in the very next words, that God, in his special care of them, had numbered the very hairs of their heads; that not a sparrow fell to the ground without his knowledge, much less would they — "*fear ye not*, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows."

Matt. v. 29. "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell"— *Gehenna*.

30. "And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell"— *Gehenna*.

Matt. xviii. 9. "And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire"— *Gehenna tou puros*.

Mark ix. 43. "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands, to go into hell (*Gehenna*,) into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

45. "And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell (*Gehenna*,) into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

47. "And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God, with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

These are the only remaining passages where *Gehenna* occurs, and the reader will see how largely they are repetitions, merely for the purpose of emphasis. The same thing is said of the eye, the hand

and the foot; and while Matthew and Mark report the same sayings of Jesus, thereby doubling the number of passages, Matthew repeats in chapter xviii. what he had previously recorded in chapter v. So that though *Gehenna* appears six times, a comparison of the passages reduces them to a single example. The only difference in the texts being the addition by Mark of some of the loathsome accompaniments of *Gehenna*, the undying worm and the unquenchable fire. And in this, the only instance in the New Testament where they are associated with *Gehenna*, the Saviour doubtless had in mind the passage in Isaiah lxvi.: "They shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men who have transgressed against me; *for their worm dieth not, neither shall their fire be quenched*—and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." The expressions in both cases being intensive, employed to deepen the coloring of the sombre picture of judgment, and to add terribleness to the description.[1]

[1] That the undying worm and the unquenchable fire are not expressive of endless duration, the following facts are in evidence:

STRABO calls the lamp in the Parthenon, and PLUTARCH calls the sacred fire of a temple, "unquenchable," though they were extinguished ages ago. JOSEPHUS says the fire on the altar of the temple at Jerusalem was "always unquenchable," ἄσβεστον ἀεί, though the fire had gone out and the temple was destroyed at the time of his writing. EUSEBIUS says certain martyrs of Alexandria "were burned in unquenchable fire," though it was extinguished in the course of an hour! All the phrase means is that the fire was thoroughly destructive, burning till it had consumed all—a metaphor for complete destruction. The following from a war speech by an "Evangelical" clergyman, will illustrate its scriptural use and meaning:—"God's fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge this nation. The wheat—maintenance of Government, loyalty to God, and the freedom of all—shall be garnered up to enrich the nation's future. But the chaff—impiety, rebellion and slavery—shall be burned with unquenchable fire." That is, they shall

The plain meaning of the Saviour is this: It is better for you to give up all worldly interests, though dear as your right eye or right hand, if they keep you back from the kingdom of God, the gospel kingdom, the life of divine truth; for it is better to part with these, and become my disciples, and enjoy that eternal life which is to know God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent; than, retaining these, to refuse the truth of God, the gospel of his Son, and so have part in the fiery judgment which is coming upon this wicked generation. And in order to set forth the terrible and utterly destructive character of this judgment, this day of wrath, he describes it under the figure of *Gehenna*, with its unquenchable fires, its perpetual putrefaction and ever breeding worms.[1]

Gehenna, then, was used to represent any dreadful judgment or, as Schleusner says, "any severe punisment, especially an infamous kind of death." Much as Sodom was used to represent any very wicked or corrupt city or people, as in Ezekiel xvi. 46–56, where Sodom means the half heathenish Israelites, or per-

be thoroughly destroyed and abolished. In a standard author we have the expression, "*unquenchable love* of freedom;" and another, speaking of a celebrated actress, says, "She was the best tragedian of her times, with an *inextinguishable fire* in her heart," and immediately adds, alluding to her death, "we must deplore the extinction of her fire." A newspaper, speaking of a comic personage, remarks that what he did "created *inextinguishable mirth*." And this is the very expression in English, which Homer has in Greek, ἄσβεστος γέλως, (Iliad, i. 599,) *unquenchable laughter*. In these examples, as in the Bible usage, there is no reference to duration, but to intensity only — the meaning is *great, excessive*.

[1] Dr. ALBERT BARNES says: "The extreme loathsomeness of the place, the filth and putrefaction, the corruption of the atmosphere, and the lurid fires blazing by day and by night, made it one of the most appalling and terrific objects with which a Jew was ever acquainted."

haps the neighboring heathen themselves. And in Rev. xi. 8, Jerusalem is called Sodom and Egypt, because of its utter vileness and wickedness. Much as we of this day use the name of *Waterloo* to represent a great political conflict: "It was a Waterloo defeat" — i. e., thorough, complete, irreparable. So with the Jews, the overthrow of a people, the destruction of a city, was called a *Gehenna judgment* — i. e., a thorough and utter destruction.

This closes the New Testament usage of the word; and it is obvious to every candid mind that the assertion is utterly destitute of proof, that *Gehenna* was used by the Jews of our Saviour's time to designate a place of endless torment for the wicked, or that it bears that meaning in the New Testament.

Our inquiry shows that it is employed in the Old Testament in its literal or geographical sense only, as the name of the valley lying on the South of Jerusalem — that the Septuagint proves it retained this meaning as late as B. C. 150 — that it is not found at all in the Apocrypha; neither in Philo, nor in Josephus, whose writings cover the very times of the Saviour and the New Testament, thus leaving us without a single example of contemporary usage to determine its meaning at this period — that for one hundred years after Josephus there are no Jewish writings extant, thereby shutting out all evidence as to what was its popular usage and signification for one hundred and seventy years after Christ — that from A. D. 150–195, we find in two *Greek* authors, Justin and Clement of Alexandria, the first resident in Italy and the last in Egypt, that *Gehenna* began to be used to designate a place of punishment after

death, but not *endless* punishment, since Clement was a believer in universal restoration — that the first time we find *Gehenna* used in this sense in any *Jewish* writing is near the beginning of the third century, in the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, two hundred years too late to be of any service in the argument — and lastly, that the New Testament usage shows that while it had not wholly lost its literal sense, it was also employed in the time of Christ as a symbol of moral corruption and wickedness; but more especially as a figure of the terrible judgments of God on the rebellious and sinful nation of the Jews.

SECTION IV.

TARTAROSAS — ITS MEANING — THE HEATHEN HELL — "THE ANGELS THAT WERE CAST DOWN TO HELL."

Ταρταρώσας, — *Tartarosas*, the word being a participle, is found only in 2 Peter ii. 4: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment," &c. Jude, who cites the same illustrations in enforcing his exhortations, has it thus: "And the angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." Verse 6.

Although this chapter has legitimately only to do with the word "hell," yet it will be necessary, in order to understand this passage, to notice several other points.

1. This is the first and only allusion in the Bible to fallen angels. There is not a word in the Old

Testament on the subject, neither in the historical, prophetic or poetic books. The Saviour in all his ministry never alluded to anything of the kind; nor any of his disciples, save Peter and Jude. Now, if the texts cited are to be understood literally, as an actual historical record, is it probable that such a profound silence would have been observed in regard to so important an event, till forty years after the death of Christ?[1]

2. It is plain that the story of the fallen angels was well known to those whom Peter and Jude addressed. Though this is the first time it appears in the sacred writings, it is introduced without explanation; and it is taken for granted that the readers have heard of it before. The tradition, therefore, must have been common and popular, or the apostles would not have referred to it in such a familiar way.

3. The Jews certainly had a tradition of this sort current among them. Before the birth of Christ, they had come to believe that "the sons of God" mentioned in Gen. vi. 2, were angels, who, enamored of the beautiful daughters of men, left their heavenly habitations, of their own accord, that they might dwell with them on earth. Josephus makes mention of this: "For many angels of God accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good,"[2] &c. Of course, as there is nothing of this sort in the Old Testament, it was a fiction of their own invention. The "sons of

[1] All commentators agree that Rev. xii. 7-17, refers to the conflicts between Paganism and Christianity. Besides, the dragon and his angels were "cast out *into the earth*," and *there* "persecuted the woman which brought forth the man-child."

[2] "Jewish Antiquities," Book i. chapter 3.

God " in Gen. vi. were not angels, but the true worshippers of God; probably the descendants of Seth, in distinction from those of Cain.

4. This tradition or fiction respecting the angels, was wrought out with all the extravagant fancies and wild absurdities and inventions characteristic of the Jewish mind; and about the time of our Saviour's birth, or just before, it appeared in full dramatic costume in the celebrated "*Book of Enoch*," written by some foreign Jew. In this, we have the whole story in detail, resting on the above-named absurd interpretation of Gen. vi. by the later Jewish teachers.

The story begins with chapter vii. thus: "It happened, after the sons of men had multiplied in those days, that daughters were born unto them, elegant and beautiful. And when the angels, the sons of heaven, beheld them, they became enamored of them, saying to each other, Come, let us select for ourselves wives from the progeny of men, and let us beget children."

Then follows an account of the increase of impiety and wickedness on the earth; and chapter x. carries the story forward as follows: "Then the Most High, the Great and Holy One spake, and said to Raphael, "Bind Azazyel hand and foot; cast him into darkness; and opening the desert which is in Dudael, cast him in there. Throw upon him swift and pointed stones, covering him with darkness. There shall he remain forever; cover his face, that he may not see the light. And in the great day of judgment let him be cast into the fire." To Michael, likewise, the Lord said, "Go and announce his crime to Samyaza, and to the others who are with him. And when all

their sons shall be slain, when they shall see the perdition of their beloved, bind them for seventy generations underneath the earth, even to the day of judgment."

Then the angels besought Enoch to intercede for them, which he did; when, suddenly, he fell asleep, and a vision of punishment or judgment was shown him, at the close of which the Lord said to him:

"Go, say to the watchers of heaven who deserted the lofty sky, and their holy everlasting station: You ought to pray for men, and not men for you. Wherefore have you forsaken the lofty and holy heaven, which endures forever, and defiled yourselves with the daughters of men; and taken to yourselves wives; and acted like the sons of the earth, and begotten an impious offspring!"

It is easy, from these extracts, to see what was the tradition, current among the Jews regarding the fallen angels; and it is plain enough that Peter and Jude quote this tradition from the Book of Enoch, where it had been put into dramatic form. Note the following correspondences:

1. Jude says the angels "kept not their first estate," and Peter says they "sinned." The author of the "Book of Enoch" says they kept not their "holy and everlasting station," and "sinned" and did wickedly.

2. Jude says they "left their own habitation," not that they were driven out, or cast out, as Milton has it. *It was voluntary.* This agrees perfectly with Enoch, who says, "they *deserted* the lofty sky," and that they had "*forsaken* the holy heaven"—i. e., of their own accord.

3. Peter and Jude say they were bound in "chains of darkness, reserved unto the judgment of the great day." This is almost the exact language of the book of Enoch, which says, "Bind Azazyel hand and foot, and cast him into darkness," and there leave him, "even to the great day of judgment." And where Jude has "everlasting" the apocryphal book has "forever."

4. Peter says they were "cast down to hell," (*tartarus*,) the prison of the pagan *hades* or *underworld*. The author of Enoch has it "underneath the earth," which is precisely the same thing, *hades*, which includes *tartarus*.

These resemblances are too many and exact to be the result of accident; and consequently it is agreed by some of the best critics that the apostolical passages are quoted from the Book of Enoch in the way of illustration.[1] Of course this is done without endorsing the authority of the book, or the truth of the tradition. Peter does not adopt the absurdities, nor accept the doctrine of the heathen *tartarus* or "hell," any more than Christ did in the Rich man and Lazarus. He simply enforces his exhortation by reference to a popular tradition; just as we do at the present time in multitudes of cases.

[1] JUDE makes another quotation from this book in verses 14, 15. "And Enoch also the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, "Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all," &c. The passage in the Book of Enoch reads thus: "Behold, he comes with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon them, and to destroy the wicked," &c. The fact of quotation was allowed by many of the ancient fathers, CLEMENT, ORIGEN, HILARY, &c., who were inclined to think the book canonical for this reason. Professor STUART, Bib. Repos. for January, 1840.

And Jude has done the same thing in verse 9, by quoting from another apocryphal Jewish work, called the "Assumption of Moses." This book contains a ridiculous story about the burial of Moses, the substance of which, in few words, is this: The arch-angel Michael was busily engaged in burying the body of the great Lawgiver, bestowing suitable funeral honors; when suddenly the devil appeared, and endeavored to prevent his burial, on the ground that he was a murderer, having killed the Egyptian, and was not therefore entitled to honorable burial. The result is a violent dispute between Michael and Satan, which, on the part of Michael, is conducted in a very gentlemanly and respectful manner, probably in consideration of Satan's former rank and dignity. To this absurd fable of the Jews, Jude alludes as follows: "Yet Michael the arch-angel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee." And the object of this quotation is obvious from the context, where he argues from it that those who "deny the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ," ought *not* thus to "speak evil of dignities." For if, as your traditions say, Michael would not bring "a railing accusation" even against the devil, how much less should scoffers speak evil of heavenly dignities.

It would be an outrage on the inspiration and the common sense of Jude to suppose, because he quotes this story, that therefore he adopted it as the truth of God, believed it himself, or sanctioned its belief by others. And it would equally outrage the inspiration of both Jude and Peter to suppose, be-

cause they quote the popular fable about the fallen angels from the Book of Enoch, that therefore they accepted the story as true; and believed in their deserting heaven, their marriage with the daughters of men, their wickedness, and their being cast down to Tartarus or the heathen hell!

The plain fact is that these citations are introduced *for the purposes of illustration* — just as we refer to the fictitious characters, the ghosts and witches of Shakespeare, and to the popular traditions and superstitions of the past, to illustrate an argument or narrative, without at all endorsing the truth of the stories, or the actual existence of the persons.[1] The Old Testament contains similar references and quotations from uninspired books, as in Joshua x. 13, from the "Book of Jasher;" and in Numbers xxi. 14, from the "Book of the Wars of the Lord." And Paul in 2 Tim. iii. 8, quotes the account of Jannes and Jambres withstanding Moses, from tradition; or as Origen says, from a Jewish book. No such persons are named in the Old Testament records. He repeats the popular story simply to compare with them those of his day who "resisted the truth, men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith."

[1] LAWRENCE'S translation of the Book of Enoch, chapt. vii., *et seq.* of sec. ii. MARSH'S Michaelis, vol. iv. 378–393. Dr. SAWYER'S article on Fallen Angels, in the Universalist Quarterly for July, 1844, is an excellent and conclusive treatment of the subject. LARDNER inclined to the opinion that Peter and Jude refer to persons and events in the Old Testament; and that the "angels," or messengers, were wicked men. *Works*, vol. vi, 309–314. Mr. BALFOUR adopts this view of the text in his "First Inquiry." ADAM CLARKE'S preface to Jude is special pleading; for it is not pretended that the "Assumption of Moses;" and "The Death of Moses," or the *Phetirath Mosheh*, are the same work.

CHAPTER XIII.

ORIGIN AND USAGE OF METAPHORS AND FIGURES OF SPEECH, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE BIBLE.

SECTION I.

ORIGIN AND USE OF METAPHORS.

I have thought that a chapter concerning the origin and usage of figures and metaphors in the sacred writings, with brief observations on figurative language in general, would serve to illustrate some portions of Scripture not coming legitimately within the scope of this volume, yet having more or less relation to the several subjects discussed in it. At the same time, a knowledge of the facts will add greatly to the pleasure and profit of reading the Bible, and show that the difficulties in the way of understanding its meaning, lie rather in our ignorance than in the strangeness and obscurity of the Book itself.

Every language has its periods of infancy, growth, maturity and decline; and at the two extremes of infancy and maturity, it abounds in figures and metaphors; in the first case from necessity, in the second from choice. In a state of barbarism, or of savage life, man's wants are few, the range of his thoughts and desires is narrow, and his life is mostly

of the senses, the life of the animal. Of course his speech takes its character from his experience. Without any knowledge of the arts or sciences, with no literature or intellectual culture, his language is necessarily destitute of any terms or words expressive of these things; his vocabulary is very limited and poor, confined mostly to objects of sense, consisting chiefly of nouns and verbs, the names of things, of bodily conditions and wants. There are few words expressive of abstractions, of qualities in their independent and absolute character; or in other words, there are few adjectives or descriptive terms.

The language of a people, in fact, passes through the same process of growth and development which we see in the language of a child. In beginning to talk the child has but few words, and those expressive of objects of sense, and of physical condition, the names of things and wants; with here and there an adjective, or a qualifying, descriptive word, such as *good*, *bad*, *pretty*, *ugly*. It may early learn the word bread, but it will be long before it will be able to go beyond this in describing its qualities. It will soon catch the names dog and cat, but it will be years before it can describe the first as faithful, devoted, affectionate, watchful, intelligent; or the last as home-loving, playful, wily, treacherous, &c.

So with a people in their rude and barbarous condition, or before they have attained to the civilization of science, philosophy and letters. Their language being poor, and restricted to comparatively very few descriptive terms, they are constantly compelled to resort to comparisons, to figures or metaphors. Hence they say of a brave man, "he is a lion"; by

which they express simply resemblance in character. Having no such abstract terms as *brave, courageous, heroic, valiant, fearless, intrepid,* they are obliged to resort to comparisons, to express their thought of him by giving him the name of an animal known to possess these qualities. So when they would describe a cunning, artful, intriguing, wily man, having no adjectives of this sort, they call him "a fox"; using the literal term in a figurative sense to set forth his character. And these comparisons are multiplied just in proportion to the poverty of their vocabulary — a treacherous person is "a snake in the grass"; a swift-footed runner is "a deer" or "a bird"; a fierce warrior is "a panther" or "a wild-boar"; thunder is "the sky's gun"; ice is "water fast asleep"; heaven is "the happy hunting grounds," &c.

Such is the origin of figurative speech, of metaphor, which is simply the changing of a word from its literal sense to a meaning which resembles the literal sense. It is in fact a comparison or affirmation which has the force of an adjective; and which is necessitated by the meagre and deficient vocabulary of the dialect.

On the other hand, when a language has been cultivated and enriched by the growth of civilization, and new words and terms have been invented or borrowed by the poet, the orator, the philosopher, the man of letters; then figures and metaphors are multiplied again. They are employed, not from necessity, as in the former case, but from choice, to add to the variety, beauty, finish and force of the composition or speaking. And thus, as observed, in both extremes of poverty and wealth, of ignorance and cul-

ture, a language abounds in figures and metaphors, in similitudes and poetic expressions. The North American Indians are an example of the first extreme; and the poets and orators of Europe and America are an example of the last.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL METAPHORS RELATING TO DEITY.

In view of the facts now set forth, it is easy to see how the Hebrew, in the early stages of its growth, would partake largely of metaphors and similes. Poor in derivative and descriptive forms, or in adjectives and abstract terms, the people would be driven to figures and comparisons when speaking of the attributes and actions of Deity, or what they deemed such. Hence "the Lord is a man of war," he is "the Lord of hosts," he is "a Rock," "a Covert," "a Buckler and a Shield"; all which are metaphors to express the manner in which he defends his people, and shows himself "a very present help in time of trouble."

And when they would describe his power, his omnipresence, his justice, they speak of his "right arm," his "eye," "from the place of his habitation he looketh upon all the inhabitants of the earth"; "the Lord weigheth the spirits." So he "rides upon horses and chariots," "walks upon the wings of the wind," "dwells among the children of Israel," "talks" with the patriarchs, "comes down on Mount Sinai"; he "laughs," he awakes"; he "rests," &c. It would be absurd, and shocking to our reverence, to

understand these expressions literally; but it would be equally so to interpret literally those passages which ascribe to God human passions, infirmities and weaknesses. As we have seen, they are the necessities of all languages and peoples in the earlier stages of their culture. And so difficult is it, always, to master the idea of purely spiritual existence and action, that we of to-day are compelled to resort to similar forms of speech in expressing our thought of Deity, his character and action.

Under this head come all those passages which ascribe to God—*jealousy*, "I am a jealous God"; or *anger*, "God is angry with the wicked every day;" "a fire is kindled in mine anger"; or *wrath*, "The Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath"; or *hatred*, "The wicked, and him that loveth violence, his soul hateth"; or *fury*, "The Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots, like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury"; or *vengeance*, "This is the day of the Lord of Hosts, a day of vengeance, that he may avenge him of his adversaries."

Of the same character are such as the following: "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest." Ps. xi. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel." 2 Thess. i. "Because of these things, the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience." Eph. v. "Pour out the vials of the wrath of God on the earth." Rev. xvi.

It is impossible to believe that God is affected with jealousy and anger and revenge, and is roused into fierce wrath and fury, in any literal sense of these

words. The expressions are metaphors, and imply nothing more than that the divine judgments on sin and wickedness seem to indicate feelings analogous to these passions and emotions in man. In other words, they are figures representing the severity of God's punishment of wickedness; and they are no more to be understood literally than the phrases "wrath of old ocean," "the anger of Boreas," "the fury of the storm," &c.

Jeremiah (xx.) represents God as saying to the people of Judah, "I will fight against you myself with an outstretched hand and with a strong arm, even in anger, and in fury, and in great wrath. And I will smite the inhabitants of this city, both man and beast. For I have set my face against this city for evil, and not for good, saith the Lord: it shall be given into the hand of the king of Babylon, and he shall burn it with fire."

God of course cannot fight against a people; he cannot be moved by fury or anger, in any sense in which these terms are applicable to human beings. But as men are angry and wrathful when they seek to destroy each other, or when they inflict mutual evil or calamity; the calamities and judgments falling on a people for their sins, are ascribed to the anger or wrath of God. And God is represented as fighting personally against them, and destroying them; though at the same time, and in the same breath almost, it is said that the destruction of the city is to be the work of Nebuchadnezzar.

The same remarks apply to those texts which speak of God as repenting that he had created man, repenting that had he made Saul king, repenting of his

judgments on his people. Gen. vi., 1 Sam. xv., Ps. cvi. As men alter their course, or cease from what they are doing, or undo what they have done, because they have changed their minds or plans, or made mistakes, or repent of their course; so when there seems to be a change in the course of Providence, or God reverses the order of his action, it is ascribed to a like change of feeling or purpose on his part, and he is represented as repenting of his former course. This was the shortest and most direct way, and perhaps the only way at that period of linguistic culture, of describing the phenomena as they appeared to human observation. They were obliged to use these words and expressions with a secondary or metaphorical meaning.

Sometimes these passages which attribute to God the dispositions and passions, and even infirmities, of man, take on a highly dramatic form. There is a striking and, rightly understood, really beautiful example of this in Gen. xviii., where the Lord is represented as not knowing the exact condition of affairs in the guilty cities of the plain, and so resolving to "go down" and see for himself, before he sent his destroying judgments on them. "And the Lord said, Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous, *I will go down now, and see* whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know it." Because a faithful and impartial judge always carefully looks into and examines the case of the accused before passing sentence, so God is represented, in this bold dramatic style, as doing the same thing in the case of Sodom;

by which simply is expressed the perfect equity and justice of all God's dealings with the wicked and criminal.

After reading such passages as the preceding, we are ready, without much reflection, to say that the Bible is, above all other books, metaphorical, abounding in unintelligible tropes and figures of speech; and some are even inclined to ask, If it was written for our instruction, why it was not written as plainly as we talk, in homely every-day phrase? We say directly what we mean — why do not the Scriptures, if they are intended as a revelation? What is the use of figures, when the fact in plain words would have been so much better?

So think a multitude of Bible readers, and yet a little reflection would show them that the people of the Bible days, if they should come among us now, would bring the same charge against our daily speech. Really, at bottom, we are no more matter of fact in our address than they, with an allowance for the difference of national character, civilization, language and culture.

How common are such expressions as these: "The thought struck me"; "I have a certain person in my eye"; "He cast rapid glances over the crowd"; "Their hearts leaped up"; "The mouth of a river"; "The head of a bay"; "The foot of a mountain"; "The wings of time"; "A sea of faces"; "An ocean of flame," &c. Now, there is not a metaphor in the whole breadth of the Scriptures, Old and New, more unnatural, or, literally considered, more absurd and senseless than these. And a people unaccustomed to this kind of figures could make nothing out of them;

and they might ask of us, "Why do you not say what you mean? Why not say directly you think this or that, instead of representing thought as a man standing up and striking you? Why do you say you have a person in your eye, when you only remember or see him? And equally extravagant is it to talk of a sea made of faces, or an ocean of flame." (Rev. xv.: "Sea of glass mingled with fire.")

But however absurd these metaphors to a Jew, they are simple and intelligible enough to us, because we are accustomed to them. And so with those of the Bible; when once they become familiar and common, they will lose their seeming awkwardness and extravagance. The Eastern nations think them as plain, and simple in form, as we think ours are. It is familiarity with these peculiar forms of speech, and with the style of thinking and speaking, that adapts them to the ear, and transforms the figure into the fact — so that the thing represented suggests itself simultaneously with the metaphor.

Our hymns are striking examples of this, and show how easily we fall into the use of figures representing God as a man, or as having a human form, and acting accordingly. And Bible phraseology which we actually condemn in reading, as derogating from the spirituality and majesty of God, we take into our hymns, and sing without a word of objection. For example:

"He darts along the burning sky;
Loud thunders round him roar;
Through worlds above his terrors fly,
While worlds below adore."

"He binds the whirlwind to his car,
And sweeps the howling skies."

"He frowns, and darkness veils the moon,
The fainting sun grows dim at noon—
The pillars of heaven's starry roof
Tremble and start at his reproof."

"On cherubim and seraphim
Full royally he rode,
And on the wings of mighty winds
Came flying all abroad."

These are as bold figures, and in their literal interpretation as contrary to fact, as any in the Scriptures; and yet, taking them out from the Scriptures, we sing them without any question of their propriety. They have become, as it were, domesticated with us, and we lose sight of the metaphor in the idea it represents, in the thought of which it is only the vehicle, or symbol.

SECTION III.

METAPHORS DERIVED FROM LOCAL CUSTOMS AND OPINIONS.

In order to understand the meaning of certain classes of figures, we must have a knowledge of the civilization, social state, occupations, arts and sciences out of which they come; or at least a knowledge of the special application and usage of them. For example: Since the days of the prophets, of Paul and Luke, the world has greatly advanced in every department of knowledge and material improvements, and certain words and phrases and metaphors have arisen out of these, wholly unknown to the ancients. We have a variety of tropes and figures of speech drawn from steamboats, railroads, telegraphs, the printing press, gunpowder, chemistry, astronomy, the

microscope, &c., which would be wholly unintelligible to the Jew of the Old Testament; because he could have no knowledge of the great facts and entities in which they have their origin. In order to understand our speech in this respect, he must first become acquainted with railroads, printing, modern chemistry, &c., and know how these terms or metaphors are employed and applied.

So with us, in regard to ancient customs, arts and occupations: we must acquire some information on these points, if we expect to understand the allusions to them in the Scriptures. As an example; without this particular knowledge such passages as these are unintelligible: "The elders have ceased from the gate"; "his children are crushed in the gate;" "he openeth not his mouth in the gate;" "they turn aside the poor in the gate;" "they hate him that rebuketh in the gate;" "hate evil and establish judgment in the gate;" "her husband is known in the gates;" "and all the people that were in the gate, and the elders, said, we are witnesses."

But these passages are plain enough when we come to know that in primitive times the elders, or aged men, distinguished for their wisdom and integrity, used to assemble at the gates of the town, where they sat together on benches, to hear and adjust any complaints or disputes among the people, and to administer justice in all cases of controversy. The object in assembling at the gates was to be within reach of all, it being the most public place in the city; and all passing in or out, could bring their cause before them at once, and have it heard and settled on the spot, without the tedious and expensive legal delays of our time.

This being the case, it is easy to see how the word "gate" came to be a metaphor for justice, or the synonym of the place of judgment. Then we readily understand what is meant by crushing the poor in the gate — i. e., depriving them of their rights, by perverting justice; and by the saying, "The elders have ceased from the gate;" or, in other words, justice or judgment has ceased from the land; fraud and robbery abound everywhere. So the husband of the virtuous woman is known in the gate — i. e., is in repute for his justice and honorable character, and is set in the place of judgment to see to its faithful administration.

A great many very beautiful metaphors, and rich in doctrinal and spiritual instruction, are derived from the various occupations and employments of the people. This is particularly the case with regard to the *Shepherd and his Sheep*. The rulers and teachers of the people are described under the figure of shepherds, while the people are represented as the flocks. And the magistrates and priests are thus rebuked by Ezekiel for their neglect of the sheep, for their avarice in enriching themselves and living luxuriously at the expense of the people: "Wo be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool; ye kill them that are fed; but ye feed not the flock; neither have ye sought that which was lost, but with force and cruelty have ye ruled them; and they were scattered, because there was no shepherd." "Behold, I am against the shepherds, and I will cause them to cease from feeding the flock; neither shall they feed them-

selves any more. I will seek out my sheep, and I will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day. I will feed them in a good pasture, and upon the high mountains of Israel shall their fold be." Ezekiel. xxxiv.

And with what exceeding beauty David pictures the tenderness of the Divine care in a metaphor drawn from this occupation, with which he was so well acquainted in his youth, when he watched his father's sheep: "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters." Psalm xxiii. And Isaiah says, in the same strain, "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young." xl. 11.

And in John x. the Saviour carries the metaphor through all the changes of this pleasing occupation; and declares himself to be "the good shepherd who giveth his life for the sheep," who "calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out; and goeth before them, and the sheep follow him, for they know his voice." [1] And then, at the close of the extended

[1] "In Lithuania and Muscovy, as soon as the sun has risen, the herdsman daily winds his horn; and on the well known signal, the stalls are opened, and the horses and mules, goats, sheep, &c., *obey the summons.* As soon as they are assembled in a body, *he marches at the head of them*, whilst they obsequiously *follow their leader* into such meadows as he sees most convenient for them. By a second signal, they are led to water; and by a third, they are conducted home again." When Dr. Henderson was in Iceland, struck by the intelligent readiness of the flocks, and the singular understanding existing between the sheep and their keepers, he inquired of two shepherd girls.

metaphor, with what force and directness he announces the comforting and joyful truth of the final ingathering of all the wandering sheep: "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; *and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.*" And thus does he confirm the teaching of the parable of the Lost Sheep, for whom the shepherd "goeth into the mountains," and *seeketh until* "*he hath found it,*" and then laying it on his shoulders, returneth home rejoicing. Matt. xviii., Luke xv.

Thus, through these beautiful figures, do the Scriptures teach the ever-blessed truth of the Lord's tender mercy, and solicitous watch for the welfare and safety of his flock; and the certainty that at last every lost sheep shall be found, brought back from the wilderness, restored to the *one* fold, and evermore be permitted to lie down in the green pastures, and rest by the still waters of the heavenly Palestine!

Many examples of scriptural tropes and figures of speech, or at least the peculiar point and propriety of them, are dependent on some local peculiarity or usage, without a knowledge of which one not only cannot see any fitness in them, but an apparent absurdity.

To say an obstinate man is a perfect mule, is a metaphor much more significant to a South American or a Swiss than to the people of Holland or Africa. And to compare anything to the Alps or the Andes, would have a force to them which it could not have to one who had never seen these mountains.

how they distinguished and controlled so easily every individual sheep "O," said they, "*we know them all by name.*"

So when the prophet compares the noble and wealthy women of Israel to the herds of Bashan, it seems to us bordering on the absurd. But when we learn that Bashan was noted for the richness of its pastures, and the beauty of its cattle herds, we see that the point is in this, making it a symbol of the luxury and wantonness of the Israelitish women, growing out of their riches and abundance. Amos iv. Similar examples in Deut. xxxiii., where Joseph is called a "young bullock," and Dan "a lion's whelp," and in Gen. xlix., where Issachar is called "a strong ass."

Matt. iii. 12, is a figurative description of the wicked Jews and of their destruction. "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

This continued metaphor is drawn from the method of winnowing grain in that country. They used a shovel or fan, throwing up the wheat, the wind driving the chaff into a heap on one side, and the grain falling to the ground, till the threshing floor was throughly purged or cleaned. The fire was set to the heap of chaff, which burned till the whole was consumed; and the grain was gathered into the garner. The metaphor makes the disciples of Jesus the wheat, and the Jews the chaff; and the garner represents the security promised to the faithful followers of the Saviour, and the unquenchable fire the complete destruction of the Jewish nation. The word "unquenchable" simply implies that it will burn till what it feeds on is wholly consumed. As we say often, when the engines make little impression on a fire, "It is useless; it cannot be extinguished," —

meaning not that it will burn forever, but till it has entirely destroyed the building.[1]

Gehenna, Hell, or the Valley of Hinnom, as we have seen, was the place where all the filth and offal of Jerusalem were deposited; where the worm revelled in its foul banquet of putrid flesh, and perpetual fires were kept up to consume the dead bodies and offensive matter brought there. This place, therefore, so horrible in its associations, was made the symbol of every loathsome and dreadful thing, and the name of it was fittingly employed by the Saviour as a metaphor to describe the consuming judgments of God on the Jewish nation, and especially the guilty Jerusalem.

The word *Devil*, though not strictly coming under this head, may be noted here. The Jews, after the captivity, and a long intercourse with the heathen, adopted the notion of a powerful evil spirit, waging continual war against God, and the bitter enemy of man's virtue and happiness. His name, "devil," and its synonym "satan," were employed as metaphors by the Saviour to represent the hostility to the gospel of the Jewish hierarchy, (the Chief Priests, Scribes and Pharisees). They were described as the "devil" or "evil one" who sought to destroy the word of God, and their agents as his angels.

Hence Christ says, the enemy that sowed the tares is the "devil"; and again, "When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then

[1] I think the origin of the metaphor in Matt. iii. 12, "unquenchable fire," is not the same with that in Mark ix. 43–47, "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." The derivation of the first is correctly given above, and that of the last is explained in Section iii. of Chapter xii.

cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart." Matt. xiii. Here the devil" and the "evil one" are terms descriptive of the Scribes and Pharisees; and the metaphor is most happily illustrated in the case of the blind man in John ix., where they tried so long, and argued so earnestly, and lied so wickedly, to catch away the seed of truth which Jesus had sown in his heart. And how simply and admirably he replied to them, and confounded them, and sent them away defeated; thereby illustrating another passage which says, "Resist the devil and he will flee from you." Jas. iv.

The apostles employ the word, also, as a figure to represent the Heathen secular power in opposition to Christianity. The Revelator says to the members of the church in Smyrna, "Fear none of these things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the Devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days." Chapt. ii. Here the Devil is the Roman government or magistracy which persecuted and imprisoned the Christians. Indeed, the term is properly applied in figure to any persons, or influences, opposed to the Truth of God, or to the virtue and welfare of mankind.

SECTION IV.

METAPHORS AND IMAGES TAKEN FROM NATURAL OBJECTS AND PHENOMENA.

Making speech visible, or representing thought by symbols or pictures, was, perhaps, the first step toward letters or a written language. Examples of this kind of writing may be seen in the hieroglyphics of Egypt, and the rude pictures of the Mexicans. The

method was to make one thing stand for another to which it had some likeness or resemblance. Visible objects were made to represent invisible realities, abstractions, principles, virtues, vices, &c. For example: An *ant* was used to symbolize *industry;* a *lion* represented *courage* or *royalty;* a *mouse* was the emblem of *destruction;* a *serpent with its tail in its mouth,* making a circle, represented *eternity;* the *sun, moon* and *stars* were used to represent States and Empires, or the kings and queens and nobles composing the State.

Taking the last example, it will be seen that the overthrow and destruction of a kingdom or nation, would be set forth under the figure of an eclipse of the sun and moon, or their being darkened or turned into blood, the falling of the stars, the destruction or passing away of the heavens, &c.[1]

These metaphors were taken up by the Jewish prophets, and freely applied to the events of their own times; and the example was followed by the Saviour and his apostles. Nothing is more common in prophetic language, than to represent great commotions and changes in the earth, or wars and revolutions among the nations, under the figure of changes and revolutions in the heavens, or commotions among the celestial bodies. The fall of *Babylon* is represented by the stars and constellations of heaven withdrawing their light; and the sun and moon being darkened. Isai. xiii. 9, 10. The de-

[1] WARBURTON's Divine Legation, vol. ii. B. iv. LOWTH's Isaiah, note on xiii. 10. See, also, NEWTON's Dissertations on the Prophecies. LIGHTFOOT's works, vol. iii., vi. and xi. PAIGE's Selections, See article, and MACKNIGHT on the Epistles, Essay viii.

struction of *Egypt*, by the heaven being covered, the sun enveloped with a cloud, and the moon withholding her light. Ezek. xxxii, 7, 8. The destruction of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes is represented by casting down some of the host of heaven, and the stars, to the ground. Dan. viii. 10

So Christ announces the passing away of the old dispensation, and the destruction of the Jewish State and Church: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken, and *then* shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven," &c. Matt. xxiv. And Peter, speaking of the same event, employs the same metaphors: "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away (the Jewish State shall be destroyed) with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up..... Nevertheless, we, (the believers,) according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth (the Christian Gospel kingdom) wherein dwelleth righteousness." 2 Pet. iii. And on a former occasion, years before, (Acts ii.,) he had quoted similar language from Joel, as descriptive of the overthrow of the old law dispensation, secular and religious — "This *is* that which was spoken by the prophet Joel (it was then being fulfilled,) .... I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke; the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the

Lord come." The wonders which the people then saw, were the heralds of the incoming of that great and notable day of the Lord, when the sun and moon, and the whole frame-work of the Jewish heaven and earth would be dissolved and pass away in blood and vapor of smoke, and give place to the new heaven and new earth of the Gospel.

The following from Orthodox theologians and commentators, distinguished for their learning and profound knowledge of the Scriptures, will further illustrate the usage of these bold metaphors and terrible images drawn from natural objects.

Hammond, on 2 Peter iii. 7–13, says, "What is here thus expressed by St. Peter, is ordinarily conceived to belong to the end of the world, and the beginning of the *Millennium*, or *thousand years*. And so, as St. Peter here saith, verse 16, many other places in St. Paul's epistles, and in the gospel, especially Matt. xxiv., are mistaken and wrested. That it doth not belong to either of these, but to this fatal day of the Jews, sufficiently appears by the purport of the whole epistle, which is to arm them with constancy and perseverance, till that day come, and, particularly in this chapter, to confute them who object against the truth of Christ's prediction, and resolve it should not come at all, against whom he here opposes the certainty, the speediness, and the terribleness of its coming. That which hath given occasion to those other common mistakes, is especially the hideousness of those judgments which fell upon that people of the Jews, beyond all that before are related to have fallen on them, or, indeed, on any other people, which made it necessary for the prophets, which

were to describe it, (and who use tropes and figures, and not plain expressions, to set down their predictions,) to express it by these high phrases of the *passing away* and *dissolving* of *heaven*, and *earth*, and *elements*, &c., which, sounding very tragically, are mistaken for the great, final dissolution of the world."

Witsius. "It certainly cannot be denied, that the manner of speaking, used by the holy prophets and apostles, countenances the opinion of those who call the Messiah's kingdom the beginning of the new world, or age. Thus, according to the prophet Haggai ii. 6, God says, 'When he shall send him who is *the desire of all nations, will he shake the heavens, the earth, the sea, and the dry land.*' Likewise, according to Isaiah lxv. 17, God says, '*Behold I will create new heavens, and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind.*' Again he says, lxvi. 22, '*The new heavens and the new earth which I will make, shall remain before me.*' This agrees with Rev. xxi. 1, where we read, '*And I saw a new heaven, and a new earth; for the former heaven and the former earth had passed away: and there was no more sea.*' Nor does St. Peter differ from this, when he says, in his second epistle, iii. 13, '*Nevtheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth.*' All these passages mean that a new scene of affairs was to be introduced into the world, by the Messiah, so that it might be considered the beginning of a new world or age.

"I cannot persuade myself to withhold from the readers of this dissertation a learned comment, which that most eminent man, *John Owen*, offers upon this last-named passage in St. Peter. He observes that

the apostle, in verses 5, 6, 7, mentions two worlds — the *old* one, which had perished by water, and that of the then present time, which was to be consumed by fire. Then, in the 13th verse, he announces a *third* world, to succeed the destruction of the last: '*According to his promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*' It is not the visible heavens, and the material earth, of which the apostle treats in either passage; because that old world of which he speaks had been already destroyed by water, and yet the material heavens, together with the material earth, still remained. By that *world*, therefore, must be understood, *mankind* living in the world. They having been destroyed by the deluge, there was founded another *world*, for the proper observance of the worship of God. The foundation of this world God placed in the family of Noah; but the whole fabric was completed by the organization of the Jewish Church. And this was the world which St. Peter, in that passage, predicted, according to the prophetic style, should be destroyed by fire. To this purport, we read in Isaiah li 15, 16, '*I am the Lord thy God, that divideth the sea, whose waves roared; the Lord of Hosts is his name. And I have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of my hand, that I might plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, thou art my people.*' At the time, therefore, when God, *dividing the sea, and leading forth his people out of Egypt*, entrusting to them his word, or his law, with the solemn appointment of his worship, thus forming them into a church for himself, then it was that he instituted and finished *this new*

world, the heavens and the earth spoken of. And, at the time when Peter wrote, this *world*—i. e., the Jewish Church, now apostatized, was about to be destroyed by fire, after the same manner in which that old world had perished in the deluge. It was by the conflagation of the temple and of the city, that the system of that world was dissolved. And the apostle commands the believers to look for another world, for new heavens and a new earth, according to the promise of God. That promise is found in Isaiah lxv. 17, and likewise, in the same words, in chapter lxvi. 32, '*Behold*,' says he, '*I will create new heavens and a new earth, neither shall the former be remembered nor come into mind.*' In these passages, the prophet describes the state of the church after the advent of Christ, when, as it is expressed in the 21st verse of the last chapter, God should take of the Gentiles for priests and Levites, or, in other words, when he should institute the gospel ministry. This state of the church, therefore, was wont to be designated, before the conflagration of that second world, as the age to come, or the future world; even as St. Paul teaches us, in the epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 5, saying, '*For unto the angels hath he not put into subjection the world to come, of which we speak*'; and likewise in chapter vi. 5, where he says, '*And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come.*'[1] Therefore, that *first* or *old* world perished by a deluge of water; the *second*, or that existing in the apostle's time, he declares should perish by fire; but the future, he intimates, was to endure

[1] That the Jews used the phrase "world to come" to designate the times of the Messiah, is shown by MEDE, NEWCOME, HAMMOND, Bishop PEARCE, &c.

even to the consummation of time. Thus far Owen in Theologuminis, Lib. iii. cap 1."[1]

Other examples of these figures may be seen in Rev. vi., where "the stars fell *unto the earth*," which shows that it cannot be understood of the material heavenly bodies, since the stars are suns millions of times larger than the earth, — in Psalm xi., where God "rains fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest on the wicked," where the metaphor is doubtless taken from the volcanic eruption and lightning tempest which caused the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, — in Rev. xiv., xix., xx., where the beast and the false prophet are "cast into a lake of fire burning with brimstone," "the smoke of their torment ascending up forever and ever"; images unquestionably borrowed from the fiery overthrow of the cities of the plain, the smoke of whose destruction continued, as affirmed, to ascend for ages, even to the time of the apostles. And even now, the whole region of the Dead Sea bears indubitable proof of its volcanic character.[2] It is not strange,

[1] Hermanni Witsii Dissertat. de Seculo hoc et futuro, Sec. 25, 26, 27; inter J. G. Meuschenii Novum Testamentum ex Talmude Illustratum, pp. 1179, 1180. Cited by Paige, pp. 307-310.

[2] PHILO (*De vita Mosis*, Lib. ii.), and JOSEPHUS (*Jewish Wars*, B. iv. cap. 8,) both witness to the existence, in their day, of memorials of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah; ruins, ashes, brimstone, smoke and occasional flames, indicative of the agencies by which their destruction was accomplished. That the appearances continue to our time, may be seen in the travels of ALI BEY, VOLNEY, POCOCKE, SHAW and others. See, also, HORNE, vol. iii. 70–74; and LYNCH'S Expedition to the Dead Sea, chapters xii.–xvii. These facts show that Jude meant something by the expression, "*set forth* as an EXAMPLE." Dr. WHITBY says: "I conceive they they are said to *suffer the vengeance of eternal fire*, not because their souls are at present punished in hell fire, but because they and their cities perished from that fire from heaven which

therefore, that, thus "set forth for an example suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," (Jude 7,) these cities, or the manner of their destruction, should furnish the metaphor of fire and brimstone and smoke as fitting descriptions of the divine judgments on the enemies of the truth, on false professors, apostates and persecuting heathen.

Even in the Pentateuch, we find a similar use of this example of divine judgment. Speaking of those who should despise the laws of God, it is said of them and the land of their abode, "And the whole land thereof (shall be) *brimstone, and salt, and burning*, like the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah." Deut. xxix. 20–24.

But the metaphors drawn from nature are not all symbolic of judgments; and I cannot better close this chapter, and the Book, than by directing the mind of the reader to the exquisitely beautiful figures of the evangelical prophet, wherein the Spirit, through him, describes the blessings of the Messianic reign, and the great restoration which is to be the crown of its glory. Before the coming of Christ and his Gospel, the earth was a moral desert, a howling *wilderness;* and the renewal wrought by these is thus described:

"The wilderness, and the solitary place, shall be glad for them; and the desert shall blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be

brought, a perpetual and irreparable destruction on them and their cities." Nothing is more common and familiar in Scripture than to represent a thorough and irreparable vastation, whose effects and signs should be still remaining, by the word everlasting." So HAMMOND, DODDRIDGE, &c.

given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon. They shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. For in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert; and the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water." And then describing the great "high-way of Holiness" over which no evil or hurtful thing shall pass, "no lion nor any ravenous beast;" it is said, "But the redeemed shall walk there; and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, *and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.*" Isa. xxxv.

What a delightful and inspiring representation of the renovating forces of the gospel in the world made desolate, even a barren waste, by the baleful influence of sin. The moral wilderness shall burst into living springs and streams, and blossom as the rose; and the waste places of evil shall finally be clothed in the abounding foliage and fruitage of Lebanon, and in all the glorious beauty of Carmel and Sharon; while the "way of Holiness," running like a track of light through all this land of promise, leads up to the gates of Paradise; and over it crowd the returning prodigals, the ransomed of the Lord, to the peace and security and blessedness of the Father's house.

And this grand consummation of the Saviour's reign and mission is described under another metaphor, derived from the *mountains* which are mentioned in the preceding figure or allegory. Mountains are a frequent metaphor in the Scriptures for political kingdoms and empires; and hence are employed as

symbols also of the spiritual kingdom of Christ, which is called "the Mountain of the Lord's house;" and is to be "established in the top of the mountains," or to prevail over all other kingdoms. Isa. ii. Accordingly we have the following beautiful metaphorical description of this result: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things . . . . and he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vail that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; *and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces;* and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth. For the Lord hath spoken it!" Isa. xxv. Compare with 1 Cor. xv., where it will be seen that the apostle applies this prophetic vision of the future to the glorious conclusion of the Saviour's reign; when, evil abolished, death destroyed, and all souls lifted by the resurrection into "the image of the heavenly," he delivers up the kingdom to the Father, and God is henceforth all in all.

And thus the THEOLOGY OF UNIVERSALISM, which begins in the Wisdom and Power and Justice and Goodness of GOD, is perfected in the complete triumph of CHRIST, and ends in the Immortal Life and Blessedness of MAN.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

	Call Number
THAYER, Thomas Baldwin AUTHOR	BX
Theology of Universalism TITLE	9941 .T5 1891